This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

823.2
Chris. Const.
Slaten

Andover Theological Seminary

ANDOVER-HARVARD THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY

MDCCCCX

CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PUBLICATIONS
IN RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

EDITED BY
ERNEST D. BURTON SHAILER MATHEWS
THEODORE G. SOARES

CONSTRUCTIVE STUDIES

WHAT JESUS TAUGHT

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

THE BAKER AND TAYLOR COMPANY
NEW YORK

THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON

THE MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA
TOKYO, OSAKA, KYOTO, FUKUOKA, SENDAI

THE MISSION BOOK COMPANY
SHANGHAI

WHAT JESUS TAUGHT

FOR DISCUSSION GROUPS AND CLASSES

By

A. WAKEFIELD SLATEN

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

ANDOVER-HARVARD
THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY
CAMBRIDGE, MASS.
A72.304

COPYRIGHT 1922 BY
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

All Rights Reserved

Published May 1922
Second Impression April 1923

Composed and Printed By
The University of Chicago Press
Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.

"The Bible is the word of Life. I beg that you will read it and find this out for yourselves—read, not little snatches here and there, but long passages that will really be the road to the heart of it."—WOODROW WILSON.

"Every relationship to mankind of hate or scorn or neglect is full of vexation and torment. There is nothing to do with men, but to love them, to contemplate their virtues with admiration, their faults with pity and forbearance, and their injuries with forgiveness."—ANONYMOUS.

"And after all, when we come to think of it, error alone is dangerous; things are what they are; how can true ideas concerning them harm us, or false ones benefit us?"—PAULSEN.

"If any man is able to convince me, and show me that I do not think or act rightly I will gladly change; for I seek the truth, by which no man was ever injured. But he is injured who abides in his error and ignorance."—MARCUS AURELIUS.

"When all is said, he that writes a book runs a very great hazard, since nothing can be more impossible than to compose one that may receive the approbation of every reader."—CERVANTES.

TO THOSE WHO ARE WILLING
TO TAKE THE PAINS TO FIND
OUT WHAT JESUS TAUGHT

PREFATORY NOTE

It is the firm conviction of the editors of the series in which this book appears that in the ideals of Jesus as set forth in his words and exemplified in his life are to be found the answers to the great questions of personal conduct and the way of life for communities and nations. There are various ways of approach to the study of these ideals, each of which has its advantages. The present volume illustrates an unusual method of study, but one which we believe to be well adapted to groups of students in colleges, and to thoughtful adults everywhere. To such they heartily commend it.

THE EDITORS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
FOREWORD		xv
HINTS TO LEADERS		xix
CHAPTER		
I.	WHY PEOPLE STUDY THE BIBLE	1
II.	WHAT THE BIBLE IS	23
III.	THE WORLD JESUS LIVED IN	44
IV.	THE IMPORTANCE AND THE DIFFICULTY OF KNOWING WHAT JESUS TAUGHT	61
V.	WHAT JESUS TAUGHT ABOUT CIVILIZATION	72
VI.	WHAT JESUS TAUGHT ABOUT HATE, WAR, AND NON-RESISTANCE	101
VII.	WHAT JESUS TAUGHT ABOUT DEMOCRACY	118
VIII.	WHAT JESUS TAUGHT ABOUT RELIGION	128
IX.	WHAT JESUS TAUGHT ABOUT HIMSELF	158
X.	WHAT JESUS TAUGHT: THE HOPE OF THE WORLD	178
INDEX		191

FOREWORD

The discussions outlined in this book are intended especially for groups of college students and of others of like maturity of mind. The field of study is limited to the three gospels, Mark, Matthew, and Luke, called, because they treat the life of Jesus from the same general point of view, the synoptists (Greek *synoptikos*, "seeing together"). It has been thought best not to attempt to discriminate between the elements of the gospels which may come directly from Jesus and those that may hail from the gospel writers themselves or from the circles of early Christian thinking which they represent. This is a task frequently attempted by scholars, but one which involves a much longer course of study than many people have time for. It has seemed more practical to take all the teachings upon a given subject which the gospels Mark, Matthew, and Luke attribute to Jesus and build these into as complete and consistent a statement as we can.

It is expected that all users of the book will keep the New Testament at hand and verify from it all statements made for which passages are cited. No textbook can take the place of direct study of the New Testament itself.

The book is designed to be usable in a variety of ways, for example:

1. Where the group leader only may have a copy of the book.
2. Where each member of the group has a copy.
3. Where members of the group may be expected to study beforehand.
4. Where the study must be made in class.
5. Where the book is used by individuals for personal and devotional study.

For the average Sunday-school class or student group, it will be advisable for each member to have his own copy. Where the group is very large and the lecture method must largely be employed, it may be sufficient for the leader alone to have a copy. Used in this way he will find the book to contain material for about thirty lectures. In summer-school and conference classes of the Y.M.C.A. and Y.W.C.A. every member of the group should be provided with the book.

Wherever possible the chapter or part of a chapter to be used for a basis of discussion should be carefully studied beforehand by the members of the group, and the gospel passages consulted. In no case, however, should the meeting of the group take the form of a recitation. The object of the book is to stimulate constructive thinking, not to train the memory. Where study cannot be expected the passages should be read and discussed in the group.

Where individuals use the book for personal study, a careful checking up of the gospel passages cited should be made, the book freely marked, and notes kept on the flyleaves of thoughts suggested by the study. When the user finds statements at variance with his present belief he should make note of them for future thought and investigation.

Only a few things are necessary to make college Bible-study discussion groups interesting and profitable. Think clearly and hard; speak with modesty and candor; never fail to make your contribution to the discussion, but beware of monopolizing class time; never slur another's views, however absurd they may seem to you; avoid overstatements and bad temper; realize that ultimately thought rules in this world, and that we get ahead by sharing thoughts; stick to the evidence; believe that people can and will find the truth and that it is best for them to have the truth; be absolutely free to follow wherever the truth leads you. It is said that all the wonderful progress made by modern science has been made by the inductive method of reasoning, and that the inductive method of reasoning consists of three stages: accurate observation, exact record, limited inference. Where these are practiced the discussions will always bring wholesome results.

The aim of the book, however, is not so much to furnish a manual of methods as to suggest a basis for class discussions and to indicate the spirit in

which discussions may be most profitably carried on. The topics chosen are those which experience with numerous discussion groups of various types, e.g., Y.M.C.A. secretaries, ministers, Y.W.C.A. secretaries, college students, Baraca classes, and groups of business men, has shown to be of formative value. In so far as the book is informational it tries to put into the user's hands facts that will be helpful to him in his personal religious thinking and in teaching and promoting classes. Most of all, though, it is hoped that, though those who use this book may not agree with one another on all points, they will find in the class a constant demonstration of Christianity, and will come to the end with that enthusiasm for service, that passion for "the Jesus way of living," that *esprit de corps* and affection for one another, that tolerance that resuts from united devotion to a great unselfish cause, which have marked the members of the discussion groups with whom the author has used these studies.

Remember the words of Jesus, "I am among you as he that serveth" (Luke 22:27). The question one is to put to one's self in every situation is, "How can I be of service to this person or to these persons so that working together we may make this a better world?" God bless you, fellow-students in the teaching of Jesus, and build you in helpful ways into the lives of hundreds and of thousands.

A. WAKEFIELD SLATEN

HINTS TO LEADERS

No certain period is specified in which a group ought to cover the chapters of this book. Some mature groups may be able to cover a chapter at each discussion. In practice, however, it has been found that each chapter furnished stimulus for several discussion periods of one hour each. The leader should not hurry the matter. The point is not to get through the book as soon as possible, but to follow the class interests, seize the moment of aroused curiosity, and hold points before the minds of the group for all possible views to be brought out and a tentative conclusion to be reached. At the close of each discussion the leader should sum up impartially and briefly the general sentiment, remembering that it represents the joint thinking of the group up to the moment, and that it may be revised later. He should regard the discussions as a process, and not look upon the sentiments expressed as unalterable decisions. This consideration tends to tolerance and temperate speech.

In every group there will be a few quiet souls who will be content to listen. Often their thinking is the straightest and most suggestive that is being done. The leader must be skilful enough to enlist their contribution, or the discussion will suffer seri-

ous loss. He can easily find a way to do this without embarrassment to the quiet one. Direct questions should be avoided in such cases, as the timid member is likely to reply, "I don't know," and thus to be confirmed in his diffidence. Skilful teachers are careful not to permit their pupils to fail in recitation, because failure destroys confidence and tends to induce an attitude of, "Well, I know I can't do it." He may speak to the silent member before or after the discussion and encourage participation. If there are several of them he may "jolly" them during the discussion as a group and get them to take part. The object of the discussion is the development of every member in thinking and in expressing his thoughts.

On the other hand, an overconfident member will occasionally emerge whose tendency is to monopolize the discussion and make himself a bore. Here skilful and quick action is necessary. As a first step, the leader may emphasize the need of general discussion and the drawing out of the thinking of all. If necessary, he may go farther and say, "We now have Mr. Blank's views before us pretty fully, let's see what some others have to say." Where the talking member is incorrigible, group action is likely to be the best way of handling him. Let the class be asked, "Mr. Blank has already spoken several times. Shall we hear him further or get the views of others?" The group will usu-

ally find a way of "sitting down" upon an obstreperous and selfish member who "likes to do all the talking."

Further, the leader must himself be on his guard that he does not himself talk too much. He is not to carry on a monologue. It has been found a good plan for him to have someone in the group hold a watch and check up the number of seconds taken by him in his remarks. He ought to take less than half the total time.

Again the leader is not to allow himself to become involved in a dialogue. He is not to debate with any member, and should interject remarks only to guide and to stimulate discussion. He must sum up fairly at the close, even though the drift of sentiment has been against his personal convictions. He is not functioning as a teacher, in the ordinary sense; he is not a lecturer; he is one of the group, presiding for the purpose of getting the topic before the minds of the group and of holding the discussion to the topic proposed. He must, if the discussion wanders into unrelated subjects, switch it back on the main track.

The leader must make himself the central figure to whom the remarks of the members are addressed. Cross-firing of remarks from one member to another takes the discussion out of his control. If he is alert and quick on the uptake and gives each member his chance, he can generally keep the control. There

should be no formality, no addressing of the leader as "Mr. Chairman"; the discussion is not a debating club.

The leader has a position that is very important and influential. He is a promoter of constructive thinking. His interest is not an abstract one, in the subject under discussion, but a concrete one, the possible effects upon thought and character of the discussion. He should be a level-headed person, mentally alert, not quick-tempered, and should have a sense of humor.

The ability to lead a discussion group well is one to be prized and developed. Clear thinking is greatly needed on all sides, in no place more so than in religion. The discussion-group leader has an opportunity for distinctive and influential service.

CHAPTER I

WHY PEOPLE STUDY THE BIBLE

Impulsive action.—People often act without any philosophy of action. Even far-reaching decisions such as the choice of a college, one's business, one's wife or husband, may be made without clearly thinking out the arguments pro and con or considering the implications of the decision. This sort of action we call action from impulse. Sometimes it turns out well, but often it is ill-advised and followed by regret. Most wrong action is impulsive action. Impulse is not a safe guide until its suggestions have been approved by calm thinking.

Action from habit or custom.—Again, in things that we have been doing for a long time, or that we are used to seeing others do, we are very liable to act without thinking why. If we follow unthinkingly our own way of acting, we are controlled by habit; if we unthinkingly copy others, we are controlled by custom. Habit and custom sometimes have good foundations, but often they have not. Neither habit nor custom is a safe guide until it has been examined as to its reason and value and we have assured ourselves of its efficiency and good sense.

Reasoned action.—The safest basis for action is reason. Taking all the relevant facts into considera-

tion, thinking out what the effects of our action are likely to be, noticing what alternatives there are, weighing what the result will be if we do not act at all, questioning whether our inclinations are biased in any way, disregarding prejudice and fear, we at length decide and act. Often, however, it is necessary to decide and act quickly, and there is not time for us to review all the facts, or see all the alternatives, or perceive all the effects. Even with plenty of time to turn over the matter in our minds we may overlook some determinative factor, or our judgment may be affected by emotion, as anger or dislike, or we may be overinfluenced by another person, and so our reasoned action turn out after all to be wrong or mistaken. Nevertheless, such a method of action comes nearest to perfection, and when a number of people reason together on a matter, their calm, united judgment is very likely to be correct. Prayer is of value both to individuals and to groups in reasoning and reaching decisions, because it steadies and quiets one and clears the mind so it can do its best work. Reasoned action, then, is most likely to be right action.

The discussion-group method.—Now in the discussion-group method of Bible-study as in perhaps no other method reasoned action tends to displace action from impulse, habit, or custom. Though probably many members of the discussion group have already, through personal reading, attendance

upon or teaching of Bible classes, correspondence courses, or other church, college, or young people's activities, given more or less attention to the Bible, experience with large numbers of people in successive classes shows that generally what has been acquired through such methods is rather a theory about the Bible than knowledge of the Bible itself. Also the general effect has been to develop what may be called the accepting type of mind, rather than the investigative, constructive type. The discussion-group method as we propose to follow it is severe in its demands for patient, free, constructive thinking. Its effects are consequently more deeply registered in character. Its appeal is to one's thinking power, rather than to impulse, habit, or custom. It presupposes that you, as a member of the discussion group, are willing to lay down anything that you may have previously thought true, if the discussions bring out facts that disprove your opinion; it presupposes, too, that, as a member of the discussion group, you are willing to take up and champion anything that may be new to you or which you may previously have thought false, if the discussions bring out facts that prove that thing true. If you cannot assume this attitude you had much better stop at this point and have nothing to do with the discussion group. The discussions of people who are already unalterably committed to any opinion result in no progress and are

likely to be painful. It is only those who are sincerely willing to reason together upon the common stock of facts who can reach a concert of opinion, or be really helpful to one another. In the discussion group action is to be based, not upon impulse, habit, or custom, but upon reason.

WHERE BIBLE-STUDY FAILS

Superficiality.—With impulse, habit, or custom as an incentive, it has long been a common thing for people to study, or to think they were studying, the Bible. Obviously, however, much of their effort was not real study. Study has been defined as "mental effort to master a problem." Study of that type always strengthens the mind, provokes original thought, arouses discussion, affects conduct, and builds character. Much so-called Bible-study has not done that, because it was not mental effort to master a problem. It involved only the passive assimilation of a mass of predigested instruction. It was thus easy, superficial, and developed only believers, not thinkers. It did not call for that tense strain of will, that merciless uncovering of one's weaknesses and ignorances which real study involves. It failed, therefore, to incite eager, robust, independent, fearless search for fact, with that search's consequent bracing effect upon character. Much so-called Bible-study fails because of its superficiality.

Misdirection.—Further, some study of the Bible that is earnest and ingenious is worthless because it is misdirected. Much sturdy walking may be done on a road that leads nowhere. In rightly directed study we take up a subject with an adequate idea of what it is, and what is to be gained from it. We do not take up French and think we are studying Greek, nor practice the cornet and say we are learning the piano. But with the Bible this has not been the case. It has often been studied as if it were something other than it is. This paragraph is not the place to go into detail, but it is right to say that there have been some sad consequences. An amount of effort has been put forth that would have made a cultured Christian gentleman, and the result has been only a fanatic or a bore. Acquaintance with these misguided Bible-students has often prejudiced people against the Bible. Moreover, the effort to reconcile an artificial view of the Bible which one has been taught with one's own reading of it, or with the results of one's studies in other subjects, often involves acute distress and sometimes the loss of faith. None of these is the Bible's fault, but the fault of previous misdirected effort and of regarding the Bible as something other than it really is. Like every other thing that has objective existence, the Bible actually is something, and has been that something all the while, no matter what may have been thought

about it or claimed for it. For lack of finding out at the start what the Bible is much time and effort has been wasted.

CONTROLLING INTERESTS IN BIBLE-STUDY

1. **Language.**—Before we go farther, or attempt to say what the Bible is and how we plan to approach it, let us think over the main interests that have controlled people in their study of the Bible. Naturally there are a number of these, and they vary in their value. To begin with the interest that is perhaps to most people the most remote and unusual, some have studied it because of its language, or more properly, its languages, for as it stood originally the Bible was in three languages, the Old Testament being in Hebrew and Aramaic, the New Testament in Greek. Only a small part of the Old Testament was in Aramaic, however,[1] and Hebrew and Aramaic are sister-languages, like Spanish and Portuguese, so that a man who can read Hebrew can easily learn Aramaic.

Now the Old Testament contains the best Hebrew that has ever been written, consequently it has an attraction for the person who is interested in that language, as many Jews and some Gentiles are.

[1] Only Ezra 4:8—6:18; 7:12–26; Dan. 2:4*b*—7:28 are written in Aramaic. Besides these there are a few Aramaic words and phrases in the New Testament, for example in Mark 5:41; 7:34; 15:34; Matt. 27:46; I Cor. 16:22.

There is another important and much larger collection of literature written in Hebrew, the Talmud,[1] but although this has much curious and interesting and valuable material, the language and style is not equal to the Hebrew of the Bible.

If a Frenchman were interested in American literature, and had a talent for language-study, he would prefer to read our best authors in the language they used, rather than in a translation. In the same way, a person who is interested in Hebrew literature, and has a talent for language-study, wishes to read the Old Testament authors in Hebrew, the language in which they wrote. Often interest in the Bible itself has created interest in its languages. Men have been led to study the Hebrew Old Testament in order to translate it into some other language, or to improve a translation already in existence. Often, too, it has been supposed that those who could read the Bible in its original languages had a great advantage, in that they could discover meanings hidden to the reader of a

[1] This is an immense collection of Hebrew learning twenty times as large as the Old Testament. It contains two parts, the Mishna, compiled in its present form by Rabbi Juda the Holy about 200 A.D., and the Gemara, written by later rabbis down to about 500 A.D. It consists of the Jewish oral law reduced to writing, plus comments on the law of Moses, or written law. Scholars are drawn to the study of the Talmud, not for its language, but for its intrinsic interest and the influence it has had upon Judaism.

translation. This is why ministers were formerly thoroughly trained in Hebrew. At the present time this advantage, which after all ministers did not very generally make much use of, is less considered, and other subjects, regarded as more essential, are emphasized.

Passing to the New Testament, the case is not in all respects the same. The New Testament does not contain the best Greek ever written. Most of it is in the common, everyday Greek of the time when it was written. Some of it, indeed, is very poor and ungrammatical Greek. In only a few places is there an attempt to use bookish language. The classic period of Greek literature was from 500 to 300 B.C., while the books of the New Testament were not written till roughly 70–170 A.D., centuries after the greatest Greek authors had passed away. Those who are interested in Greek literature and wish to read it in the original therefore prefer to read Homer and Demosthenes and Plato, rather than the Book of Revelation, or James, Peter, or Mark, or even the better Greek of the Epistle to the Hebrews and of Luke and of Paul. But if one cares for the history of language, the New Testament Greek has a great interest because it shows him how the language was changing and gives him a link between the earlier Greek of the post-classical period and the later Greek of the patristic and Byzantine periods. In fact the modern Greek of

the present day is much less different from the Greek of the New Testament than is generally supposed.[1]

2. History.—A somewhat larger group is drawn to the Bible by an interest in history. History is coming to be regarded more and more as the great teacher of mankind. While a knowledge of history does not make one able to foretell the future with accuracy, it does tend to give a broad understanding of life and enables one to see the causes of many of our present conditions. Now closely knit up with the history of all the nations of Europe and America are two elements, the Jewish people and the Christian religion. The source book for the early history of both these elements is the Bible.

The Old Testament gives what the Jews knew or believed as to their origin, their settlement in Palestine, the development of the Jewish state, the acts of their various kings, their political connections

[1] M. Hatziadakis, a modern Greek scholar, finds that 46 per cent of the words used in the New Testament are current in modern Greek today. In fact the realization that Greek is a modern language, spoken by nine million people, suggests the feasibility and interest of making the approach to ancient Greek through the medium of the modern, living language, which does not differ from the Greek of the earlier periods as the Romance languages differ from the Latin from which they spring. It is recommended that any reader who is interested in Greek form an acquaintance with a Greek. This is not difficult, as they are to be found in business in our cities and towns generally. Such an acquaintance will lead to many interesting discoveries.

with adjacent nations, their subjugation and exile, and their return to Palestine about 445 B.C. Subsequent Jewish history must be sought in other books, but the Old Testament gives the most of what is known up to this point.

Josephus, it is true, wrote fully on Jewish history up to 70 A.D., in his two books *The Antiquities of the Jews*, and *The Jewish War*, but the former is largely a re-writing and expansion of the Old Testament. Similarly, in the early Christian writers before 325 A.D., whose works have been preserved and which are collected and translated into English in a set of ten large volumes called the *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, we have much that throws light upon their own time, but their works draw upon the New Testament for whatever historical matter they present concerning the origin of Christianity. The New Testament goes farther back and gives us what at the earliest period was known and believed among the early Christians as to the origin and development of the Christian movement, including the life and teaching of its founder. Because, therefore, of interest in the Jews, or in Christianity, or because both are involved in the history of modern civilization, people have been led to study the Bible.

3. **Proof-texts.**—A third interest leading to Bible-study has been the desire to find there the basis for a belief or a defense of a doctrine. This we may call the theological, or proof-text inter-

est.[1] From a remote period this has been a powerful stimulus to Bible-study. The Jewish rabbis used the Old Testament in this way before Christianity began. The early Christians borrowed the idea from their own Jewish training or from their Jewish neighbors. The New Testament in many passages, notably in the Gospel of Matthew, shows the working of this interest. After the books of the New Testament had been written and collected into one sacred book the Christians used statements from it also in proof of the correctness of their views. Thus the Bible was largely woven into the doctrines of Catholic Christianity, and is still quoted in their support.[2]

When in the sixteenth century a great number of Roman Catholic Christians broke away from the rest under the leadership of Martin Luther in Germany, John Calvin in Switzerland, and other leaders elsewhere, these Protestants, as they were called, put a still stronger emphasis upon the Bible

[1] The cause of this interest has been the common assumption, first by the Hebrews themselves, later, and to a modified degree, by the Catholic church in its various branches, and finally and to an extreme degree in Protestantism, that in the Bible is given a divinely produced and therefore errorless book, telling what God desires people to do and believe, particularly in matters looked upon as distinctly religious. Looking upon the Bible in this way, it has been natural to turn to it as an arbiter of religious opinion.

[2] Consult, for example, Cardinal Gibbons' *The Faith of Our Fathers*, where frequent quotations from the Bible occur.

as the source book for religious belief, giving it the indisputable authority which they had formerly given to the teachings and the officials of the church. William Chillingworth, a Protestant theologian who died in 1644, is the author of the sentence that summarizes this view: "The Bible, the Bible, the religion of Protestants." It was inevitable, however, that differences of opinion should arise. Different leaders understood the Bible differently or emphasized different doctrines and won adherents to their views. Out of these groups the various Protestant denominations developed, which now, because they have become strongly organized and aggressive and have come to have traditions and a character of their own that tends to bind their members to loyalty, and, moreover, because in each there is constantly growing up an army of children, continue to exist long after the doctrinal disputes that called them into being have become dead issues. In addition to this, new sects every now and again spring up, seceding from the old ones, under leaders who take as a basis for their claims some part or parts of the Bible. It is evident that the theological or proof-text interest has had and has yet a controlling interest over the Bible-study of many religious leaders and their followers.

4. **Sermon-making.**—A fourth interest, and related to the preceding, is the homiletic or sermon-making interest felt by ministers and other speakers

on religious subjects who are accustomed to use quotations from the Bible as summaries or suggestions of their addresses, or to lend authority to what they are going to say. This interest may be seen at work in almost any public religious service, though preaching from texts is not now so much in vogue as formerly, having yielded considerably to the theme or topic method. It is still influential enough, however, to cause speakers to seek Scripture passages that will bear, or seem to bear, some relation to the topic in hand. To secure such reference, recourse is often had to what is called "accommodation," that is, the passage is treated as giving or suggesting some meaning which in its original intention it clearly did not have. Dr. John A. Broadus, a southern theological educator, in warning against this practice in his textbook on homiletics, tells of an ignorant preacher who objected to the way the ladies of his congregation wore their hair, piled high on their heads, and preached a sermon against it from Mark 13:15, "Let him that is upon the housetop not come down," leaving out the preceding words and making his text read, "Topknot, come down!" Such a searching of Scripture to find passages, which, when isolated from their context will seem to have a meaning they do not at all have when read along with the words that precede and follow them, is not limited to the ignorant. When Archbishop Lang began the campaign of

fellowship between Great Britain and the United States in March, 1918, he took for the text of his first sermon a part of Luke 5:7: "And they beckoned to their partners in the other boat that they should come and help them. And they came," the allusion of course being to the aid rendered England by America in the world-war then in progress. Though distinctly a professional interest, this use of the Bible in support of the ideas about to be propounded in a public address is a very general one.

5. **Bibliomancy.**—Another use of the Bible, by no means infrequent, arises from a belief in its value as an instrument of magic. Magic may be described as the power to produce effects, not otherwise possible, through the possession and use of certain objects or formulae. Thus among primitive peoples it has been believed that to possess a bit of a person's hair or nails gave one a power over that person. Witch doctors and sorcerers had objects and knew charms that were believed to have power to produce fortune or misfortune for the one to whom they chose to direct them. The Bible has been much used as an instrument capable of producing magic results. Among the Jews certain passages were formerly believed to have special magic powers. To stop a child from crying, to insure easy child-birth, to ward off danger, to shield one from swallowing demons when drinking

uncovered water on Wednesday or Saturday nights, when Lilith, the queen of the demons, was abroad with her myriads, specific passages were quoted. This practice of using the Bible in a magical way has been given the name "bibliomancy," or Bible-magic. A more familiar modern example of the same type treats the Bible as if it had the power of telling fortunes, or miraculously giving advice. To decide a question people have opened the Bible at random and read the first verse they happened to see, taking it as supernatural guidance. A factory owner in the East was undecided whether or not he should put up a cottage by the lake as a summer home for his family. He determined to let the Bible answer, and, letting it fall open as it would, his eye lighted on Ps. 127:1, "Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it." This he took to be an intimation that he should not build the cottage. A few trials, however, if nothing else, will convince almost anyone that it is only occasionally that the verse found will have any possible bearing on the matter in hand, and that when it does, it is purely accidental. Its only value is that it sometimes helps irresolute persons to reach a decision, just as flipping a coin does. Though the Bible has frequently been used in a magical way, it is obvious that such a use belongs in the same class with the ouija and planchette boards, and the telling of fortunes by cards.

6. **Devotion.**—Still a sixth influence that has impelled people to study the Bible has been their devotional interest. Probably all persons pray at some time in their lives, but some make prayer a daily habit. They thus feel the need of some book as a help in inducing a prayerful frame of mind, or as a suggestion for framing a prayer into words. No book fits this need for a prayer manual better than certain parts of the Bible, especially the Psalms. Most of these are in fact prayers used in the ancient Hebrew ritual of worship, as hymn books and prayer books are used in churches today. There are many other books that are helpful, such as the *Discourses of Epictetus*, or Brother Lawrence's *The Practice of the Presence of God*, or *The Imitation of Christ*, by Thomas à Kempis, or Jeremy Taylor's *Holy Living and Holy Dying*, or the books of prayers by Robert Louis Stevenson and Walter Rauschenbusch. Besides these there are the noble and ancient prayers to be found in the Book of Common Prayer of the Episcopal church, and in other church rituals. But no book is so commonly used in a devotional way as the Bible, for many of the phrases and ideas of the prayer books are themselves borrowings from the Bible. Where people practice prayer habitually they are very likely to read or study the Bible, too.

7. **Character-building.**—There remains still a seventh ground for Bible-study which perhaps ex-

plains more than any other why great numbers of people study the Bible and why organizations assiduously promote discussion groups and other forms of Bible-study. Their interest arises from a recognition of the character-forming value of the Bible. Rightly studied, with a clear, open mind, with frank discussions, with no biased approach, the Bible is bound to react upon us in such a way as to strengthen character. The reason for this lies in the nature of the Bible itself. Character is built up by numberless small decisions made in keeping with an ideal. We get our ideals from the lives of those we admire, from our own personal aspirations, and from the inspiration of books. Books furnish us with ideals according as they either depict a hero or heroine superior in some quality to ourselves, or as they show the working out of some moral principle. Examples of the first class are Victor Hugo's *Les Miserables*, Thackeray's *Henry Esmond*, and Benjamin Franklin's *Autobiography*. To the second class belong books like Edward Everett Hale's *Ten Times One Is Ten*, Charles Reade's *The Cloister and the Hearth*, Nathaniel Hawthorne's *The Scarlet Letter*, George Eliot's *Romola*, and Samuel Smiles's *Self-Help*, and *Character*.

In both these means through which books furnish ideals, the literature of the Bible is unsurpassed. In such of its books as Genesis, I and II Samuel, and the Books of Kings and Nehemiah we

have the stage full of powerful and interesting characters, while in the New Testament gospels and Acts we have Jesus and his leading followers, Peter and Paul. In Proverbs, on the other hand, and in the Minor Prophets, and in the epistles of the New Testament, we have examples of the second type, giving moral teaching. Contact with the great characters and moral teachings of the Bible thus aids us in the establishment of firm, dependable, good character.

The effect of not studying the Bible: nullification.—Though for various reasons a great many people study or use the Bible, there are a great many more who for various reasons do not read it. One may have lacked education, or have had to do hard work with long hours that prevented much reading, or one may not have cared for reading, or may have grown up among people who were not accustomed to Bible-study, or one may have, on the other hand, grown up among those who used the Bible a great deal, but in a way that gave one an aversion for it, or one may have had opportunities and have neglected them. It is not so much the cause as the effect of not studying the Bible, that we are thinking of now. The effect is that we shut out of our lives whatever contribution the Bible might have made to us. It is obvious that if one does not study Latin or algebra one must get along without the contributions that those studies would

have made to one's mind. In the same way, as long as our copy of Shakespeare stands unopened in the bookcase we have banished his genius from our lives as effectively as though his works were out of print and every copy lost. And the Bible, along with the plays of Shakespeare, and Dante's *Inferno*, and Milton's *Paradise Lost*, is one of those books people praise, but do not read.[1] But whatever the character of these classics may be it is nullified by the simple act of letting them alone. An unread and unstudied Bible is therefore almost the same as no Bible. It may not be quite the same, for Bible quotations and ideas may reach us indirectly through other reading, church attendance, or in other ways. Yet in general the aphorism holds good, an unread Bible is the same as no Bible.

[1] See the *Literary Digest* of September 13, 1919, p. 34, for the review of an article in the *London Chronicle* in which an ecclesiastical authority estimated the number of intelligent Bible readers in England as 1,350 out of a population of forty-five millions, or roughly, one in twenty thousand. This number was reached by estimating the number of persons, aside from children, who hear parts of the Bible read in church on Sunday at five millions. Of these he thinks one-tenth listen with sufficient attention to receive any lasting impression. Of this half-million he thinks one-tenth read any one book of the Bible in a consecutive way. Of this fifty thousand he reckons that only one-tenth read with any intelligent appreciation of the setting of the books of the Bible; while, finally, of this five thousand he believes not more than 1,350 read with any discrimination between the ethics and theology of the Old Testament and those of the New Testament.

Let us illustrate: Your home town, what does it mean to you? It means perhaps a clean and charming village, the dwelling-place of a thousand or so good people; it means the picturesque water tower, visible from every surrounding hilltop; it means shaded streets and comfortable homes and white-painted churches; it means peace and quiet; it means far-reaching views over a varied and beautiful landscape; it means harvested fields and shocked grain, worthy of an artist's brush; it means nature's pageant of leaf and flower and cloud and sunset; it means the stately procession of the seasons, each with its particular glory; it means the quiet graveyard where loved ones lie in their long sleep; it means home. That is what your home town means to you. What does it mean to a man in the loop in Chicago? Nothing. It is a name. He has never lived there. The town has never had a chance to weave its spell about him. He cannot feel its charm because he has left it alone. In just the same way the Bible must mean almost nothing to a person who does not study it. By the simple act of letting it alone he has made the Bible largely null and void, as if it had never been written.[1]

[1] We are to be on our guard against overstatement as to the necessity of Bible-study in the building up of character. We all know people of excellent character and often prominent in church or community service who know little about the Bible. Moreover in the Roman Catholic church Bible-study by the laity is

Recapitulation and appeal.—We have noted the roots of action as being impulse, habit or custom, and reason. We have seen how the discussion-group method appeals to reason. We have observed that superficiality and misdirection have vitiated much Bible-study. We have discussed seven influences that lead people to Bible-study, viz., their interest in language, or history, or doctrine, or sermon-making, or in the prayer life, or in deciding with regard to the future, or in the development of character. We have reminded ourselves that the Bible, like other great books, may for various reasons be neglected, and the results that might have been gained from it consequently lost.

Let us bring to our Bible-study then the clearest, hardest thinking of which our minds are capable and, while we shall remain reverent and devotional, avoid cant. It has been said, "One intelligent question mark is worth all the pious exclamation points ever written." Let us determine to use our minds. It is not important that we all think alike in the discussion group, but only that we think. If

---

not encouraged because of the liability of misunderstanding. Yet that church has many members of the most admirable Christian character. While we may well insist upon the character-building value of Bible-study we ought not thereby to animadvert upon the character of those who do not study it. Moreover, Bible ideals of conduct and character have become so thoroughly a part of our modern society that we are frequently controlled by them without recognizing their source.

Bible-study is religious—and whatever is right *is* religious—let's not make it cheap and easy. When Araunah the Jebusite offered David his oxen and yokes and flails gratis to use as a burnt sacrifice to Yahveh (II Sam. 24:23) David said, "Nay, but I will verily buy it of thee at a price; neither will I offer burnt offerings unto Jehovah my God which cost me nothing." That is the spirit for discussion-group Bible-study!

CHAPTER II

WHAT THE BIBLE IS

Literature: how it arises.—A literature may be defined as the expression in writing of the thoughts, ideals, laws, customs, and beliefs, of a people, or of some section of a people. Among the less familiar racial or national literatures of the present day there is the Yiddish, written in the international language spoken and read by modern Jews almost the world over;[1] the modern Greek, of which even professors of Greek are likely to be ignorant, while among the well-known modern national literatures are those of France, Russia, and Germany, of England and America. From various political and religious groups in the population literature springs up, too, so that there is a literature, for example, of the Socialists, the Anarchists, and the Mormons. Events of general interest and importance to the people call out literature. The belief in witchcraft in colonial days, the question of slavery, and of states rights, which came up later, the free silver question in 1896, and the Great War all called out an abundant literature. Moreover, leading men who have attracted widespread attention have been the cause of many books being written in which

[1] Ladino is spoken by the Sephardim, or Spanish Jews.

their views and actions are discussed, approved, or condemned, or in which their life-story is told. Often such men themselves write books which put into print their own ideas and reflect the thought of the people and the events of the time. Thus we may say that literature is both an outgrowth of life and a mirror in which is reflected the conditions of the life from which it arose. Through the preservation of their literatures we are able to form an idea of the way the ancient Egyptians, Romans, and Greeks lived, and what they thought on various subjects. From this historical point of view all the records of the past are valuable, since each contributes something to our knowledge of what men were doing and thinking in those days. A city directory or a telephone book is not very interesting in itself but they would show to an investigator a hundred years from now the population of a city, the general use of the telephone, and other facts. So the documents written on papyrus[1] which have been found in Egypt buried in mummified crocodiles, and the memoranda, scraps of accounts, schoolboys' exercises, letters from a farm owner to his foreman, from a son to his mother, from a negligent husband to his wife, thrown out as waste paper and covered by the wind with dry sand, dug up nearly two thousand years later and read by us, help us to see clearly how people

[1] For examples, see George Milligan, *Greek Papyri*.

were living then and what they were thinking about.

What literatures do for us.—It is easy to see that while the literatures of the past help us to understand what men thought and did in the past they do not tell us, except in an indirect way, what we ought to do and think now. When we learn what the ideas of ancient geographers were, with their belief that the rock of Gibraltar marked the edge of the world, or those of the ancient astronomers, who thought of the earth as the center of the universe, we do not feel bound to trade off our geography and astronomy for theirs. When we read in the Epistle of Barnabas, a Christian document of the second century, that the reason why Moses forbade the hyena to be eaten was because it was an animal which changed its sex, being male one year and female the next, we do not feel bound to accept his startling zoölogy, or when we find in Josephus (*Ant.* viii. 2) that he had seen a Jew named Eleazar cure demonized people by putting a magic ring to their noses and drawing out the demons through their nostrils, and that at Eleazar's command the demons would show that they had left the man by overturning a dish of water set on the ground a little distance away, we do not feel bound to assent that Josephus was right in his idea of what took place. All such stories are an indication to us of the ideas of the

time, but they do not set a mold into which our ideas must be run.

The Bible a literature, national and of groups.— The Bible is a literature, or more exactly two literatures, a larger and a smaller one. It is the literature of a people first and then the literature of a distinct group among that people. The Old Testament is the literature of a people, the New Testament the literature of a group, the Christians. And in the Old Testament itself there are books that represent various groups and tendencies among the Hebrews, while in the New Testament as well careful students find various types of thinking represented. For example, one notices quite easily differences in thought and wording between the first three of the Gospels and the fourth, and between the Epistle of James and the Epistle to the Hebrews.

Bible students made a long step forward when they began to think of the Bible as a literature, and to study it in the way that students of other literatures study theirs. They found the Bible then a more wonderful book than ever because they saw it was a book of life, that it grew out of life and reflected the events, laws, customs, and beliefs of the times when its various books were written. As it took its place among the world's great literatures it was seen to hold a place of supreme importance, for although the customs and costumes and

the political and historical events in the background, the religious ideas as well as the scientific concepts, are not those of the twentieth century, it yet enables us to reconstruct the history and thought of the Hebrew people and of the early Christians, while because of its numerous noble characters and its exalted moral teachings it has extraordinary influence in the formation and establishment of character.

The development of biblical ideas.—In Greek literature one can trace changes in ideas. For example, the later Greek philosophers felt dissatisfied with the descriptions of the deities given in the writings of earlier times. Their more highly developed notions of what a god ought to be made some of the old mythological stories seem crude and immoral. They therefore tried to find ways of explaining the myths which would relieve this difficulty. In just the same way we find a development of the idea of what sort of being the Hebrew deity, Jehovah or Yahveh (no one knows now just how his name was pronounced), was. In the earlier literature we find descriptions of him which were offensive to later and more enlightened thinkers in Israel. The prophets denounce the priestly idea of God's delight in sacrifices and ritual. We are able then to gather from the biblical literature not only here a fact of history and there a side light on social situations, but we can even trace the progress and

change of ideas among the Hebrews as these are reflected in the Old Testament.

Naturally, we cannot do this to such an extent in the case of the New Testament, for it grew up very rapidly and covered a much shorter space of time. While the Old Testament was at least 500 (about 800–167 B.C.) years in taking its present form and covers a history of some 1,100 years (about 1300–167 B.C.), the New Testament was probably complete in a hundred years after its first book was written (about 54–150 A.D.), the history it narrates covering a period of no more than 150 years (about 4 B.C.–150 A.D.). But even in the New Testament careful students trace a development of thought along some lines.

Forms of literature in the Bible.—Literature takes many forms, for example, stories of ancient times made by the writing up of folklore told at first only by word of mouth, the writing of history, basing it on traditions or on earlier records, the preserving of statistics, the stories of the lives and deeds of heroes, political and social pamphlets, important letters written by prominent men, poems and patriotic and religious songs, argument, oratory, philosophy, collections of wise saws and witty sayings, law books and books of instruction for priests, love stories, stories of hate, treachery, theft, murder, fables, dreams, stories of animals, ghosts,

witches, and the like, stories of war and famous battles and fights between heroes in single combat, sermons of great preachers and anecdotes about public men, and stories of poor boys who rose to greatness. All these types of literature can be found in the Bible. Even something like the detective story is not lacking (see, for example, Joshua, chap. 7; I Kings 3:16–28).

How to read the Bible.—The Bible is best understood when it is read as other books, not a few lines at a time, but in long stretches, a whole book or division of a book at once. If one has an easy reading knowledge of some language besides English it is always interesting to read some part of the Bible at least in that foreign language. But those whose mother-tongue was not English ought to read the Bible in English. It is best to read it in the American Standard Version, which is the best English translation.

Résumé of the books of the Old Testament.—The first six books of the Bible, Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, and Joshua form a connected narrative. Leviticus and Deuteronomy are law books giving us Jewish legal enactments and religious ritual, but not carrying forward the story. Judges covers the next period, and tells the exploits of a dozen Jewish heroes, among them Samson, the Hebrew Hercules. Ruth is a pretty love story of the same period. When we come to

I and II Samuel and I and II Kings, we are in one of the richest narrative portions of the Old Testament. One story follows another in rapid succession, and the characters are clear and bold. Here are Samuel, Eli, Elijah and Elisha, Saul, Jonathan, David, Absalom, Shimei, Ahithophel, Uriah, Nathan, Adonijah, Bathsheba, Solomon, Hiram, Ahab, Jezebel, Jehu, Naaman, Rabshakeh, Joab, Abishai, Benaiah the son of Jehoiada, and many others, each with some striking and interesting rôle to play upon the crowded stage. Next one should read Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel. These books are more easily understood after one has read the ones just mentioned. Isaiah will have special charm for a person interested in the out-of-doors because of its great number of references to nature. In these books some of the finest passages of the Bible occur. Each book, we are to remember, has some historical situation that it fits into. They were not written with the idea of being read two or three thousand years later, but have reference to affairs going on at the time they were written. It is the same way with the group of twelve little books called the Minor Prophets. They cover, in general, about 785–330 B.C.

In 586 B.C. Jerusalem was captured by the Babylonians, and the Jews were removed from Palestine and located in Babylonia. This period in Jewish history (586–537 B.C.) is called the

Exile.[1] The books of the Prophets, who were the nobler sort of statesmen and publicists of their time, were written before, during, and after the Exile. Some cannot yet be accurately dated. In fact, to determine the exact date of any book in the Bible is very difficult, and generally impossible. Usually the most that can be said is that a given book was probably written about such and such a date. This, of course, does not impair the literary and religious value of the Bible. No one knows, for example, just when the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* were written, or whether it is quite certain that there was a poet Homer who put the ancient Greek sagas into written form, but that does not take away their value for us.

There was a class of men among the Hebrews who were the schoolmasters and philosophers of Israel. They were called "wise men" and produced a number of books called Books of Wisdom. Three of these wisdom books have been preserved in the Old Testament, viz., Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Job. They are thoughtful, philosophical books with little of the story element in them. Psalms and Lamentations and the Song of Solomon are poems of religion, patriotism, and love. Esther is a story of the Persian period of the Exile, purport-

[1] Members of discussion groups often confuse the Exile with the Captivity in Egypt or with the Exodus, or with the forty years' wandering in the wilderness. The Exodus occurred about 1300 B.C.

ing to give the origin of a Jewish festival, Purim, still observed by the Jews. I and II Chronicles is a one-sided history, based on Kings, with the parts referring to the Northern Kingdom left out. Ezra tells of the return of the Jews from Babylonia to Palestine about 537 B.C., and their rebuilding in 520 B.C. of Solomon's temple, built in 970 B.C. and destroyed 586 B.C., while Nehemiah carries the story down to about 445 B.C., and tells of the rebuilding of the wall around Jerusalem and of religious reforms. Nehemiah himself is one of the manliest characters in all the Old Testament. Daniel, it is thought, was written about 167 B.C. and is a veiled review of Jewish history, written in protest against the oppressions the Jews were suffering, and with a prediction of a time when Yahveh would make the Jewish nation the rulers over a world-empire, called the Kingdom of God. This helps us to understand what would be thought of when John the Baptist and Jesus began nearly two hundred years later to rouse the people with the assertion that the time had come for the setting up of the Kingdom of God.

Old Testament Apocrypha.—In Bible-study discussion groups the question often comes up about the books left out of our Protestant Bibles, but inserted in the Roman Catholic Bible,[1] and sometimes in the large Bibles which lie on the pulpits

[1] The Douay version, made at Douay, in France, 1610.

in Protestant churches. There are fourteen of these books, and their names are I and II Esdras, Tobit, Judith, Additions to Esther, Wisdom of Solomon, Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach, Baruch, Song of the Three Holy Children, Susannah, Bel and the Dragon, Prayer of Manasseh, and I and II Maccabees. The title given to this collection of books is the Apocrypha, a Greek word meaning "hidden." It is not known just why they were so called. They were not included in the Hebrew Old Testament, but are in the Greek translation of it called the Septuagint, made about 286–100 B.C.

The Apocrypha do not contain as great a variety of literature as the Old Testament itself, but some of them are of great value and many very interesting. They furnish two examples of the Wisdom Literature, the Wisdom of Solomon, and the Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach. A copy of the Apocrypha is a thin book, costing about seventy-five cents. It is to be had in both the Authorized and the Revised Versions, the latter being preferable.

Survey of the New Testament books.—A little over half of the New Testament consists of four gospels,[1] or partial biographies of Jesus, and the Acts of the Apostles, a book so called because it tells of the doings of the apostles. After the eighth

[1] A term derived from Old English *godspel* = God story or *godspell* = good story.

chapter it is limited almost wholly to the adventures of the great early Christian missionary Paul, and his travels in Asia Minor, Greece, and elsewhere. The rest of the New Testament, except the last book, is made up of letters written by or ascribed to Paul and other prominent Christian leaders to churches and individuals. Some of these are genuine correspondence, others are epistles, or "open letters," where the writer adopts the form of a letter, but really addresses the public, that is, Christians in general. The last book, the Revelation, like Daniel in the Old Testament, is written in highly figurative language and is a protest and threat against the enemies of the Christians. Neither Daniel nor the book of Revelation has any value as showing a plan of the future. Their authors knew no more of what is going on in the world now than we know of what will be going on two thousand years hence.

In the New Testament we find reflected the ideas, beliefs, and customs of the first Christians. Their notions of the cause and cure of disease, their beliefs that human beings had conversations with angels and demons, their faith that Jesus would soon descend from the sky and set up the world's judgment, their rites of baptism and the Eucharist, their ecstatic religious meetings, their agape or love feast, which sometimes degenerated into un-Christian greed and drunkenness, all appear on the pages

of the New Testament. It preserves, too, the teaching of Jesus as this was told and retold by his followers. It shows also how Christianity, although it started as a little religious movement among the Jewish people, spread out westward from Palestine into Asia Minor, Greece, and Italy among non-Jewish peoples. This helps us to see how by 313 A.D., in the time of the Roman emperor Constantine, Christianity began to be the strongest religion in the Roman Empire. If the books of the New Testament had not been preserved we should have no original source of information as to the beginnings of Christianity, for it was so obscure at first that we find very little said about it in the Greek and Roman and Jewish writers of that time.[1]

The New Testament Apocrypha.—There are also the so-called New Testament Apocrypha, consisting of books relating to Jesus and the Christian movement, but mainly of a later period, of little historical value, and not included in the New Testament. There are about thirty of these books, their titles being as follows: the Protevangelium of James, the Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew, the Gospel of the Nativity of Mary, the History of Joseph the Carpenter, the Gospel of Thomas (in three forms, two Greek, one Latin), the Arabic Gospel of the Saviour's Infancy, the Gospel of Nicodemus (con-

[1] The few references there are, are collected and discussed in Case, *The Historicity of Jesus*, pp. 238–70.

sisting of the Acts of Pilate in two Greek and one Latin form and the Descent of Christ into Hell, in two Latin and one Greek form), the Letter of Pontius Pilate, the Report of Pilate, the Paradosis of Pilate, the Death of Pilate, the Narrative of Joseph, the Avenging of the Saviour, the Acts of Peter and Paul, the Acts of Paul and Thecla, the Acts of Barnabas, the Acts of Philip, the Acts of Philip in Hellas, the Acts of Andrew, the Acts of Andrew and Matthias, the Acts of Matthew, the Acts of Thomas, the Consummation of Thomas, the Martyrdom of Bartholomew, the Acts of Thaddaeus, the Acts of John, the Apocalypse of Moses, the Apocalypse of Esdras, the Apocalypse of Paul, the Apocalypse of John, and the Assumption of Mary.[1]

In general in these books the miraculous element plays an even larger rôle than in the New Testament, and the books purport to give information about things on which the New Testament itself is silent. Thus while in the New Testament little is told about the boyhood of Jesus, and no details are given of his life from eighteen to thirty years of age, in the apocryphal books of the New Testament numerous stories are told of Jesus' childhood; for example, of the wonderful things he did, of his making clay sparrows fly, of his stretching tables and

[1] These are collected and translated into English in the *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, VIII, 349–598. Other examples also are extant, such as the Gospel of Peter and the Apocalypse of Peter.

seats to the right size when Joseph, who was a poor workman, made them too small, of the mischief he played in a dyer's shop and how he made the cloths all the right color after he had thrown them into the furnace, how he charmed a snake that had bitten a boy, and how he struck boys dead who did anything to displease him, and so on. The New Testament Apocrypha in general show the working of religious imagination, and our picture of Jesus has gained rather than lost by their omission from the New Testament. They are valuable in this that they throw light backward upon the New Testament by showing the credulity and miracle-making facility of the age. They show, too, the natural desire for information upon features of Jesus' life which the canonical gospels do not satisfy. Bible-students should acquaint themselves with both the Apocrypha of the Old Testament and those of the New.

The Apostolic Fathers.—Of greater value than the New Testament Apocrypha is the little collection of ten early Christian productions known as the Works of the Apostolic Fathers, or more briefly as the Apostolic Fathers. These are the First and Second Epistle of Clement, the Epistle of Barnabas, some fragments of the writings of Papias, the Epistle to Diognetus, the Epistle of Ignatius, the Epistle of Polycarp, the Martyrdom of Polycarp, the Shepherd of Hermas, and the Teaching of the

Twelve Apostles. These are largely in the style of the New Testament and in them may be traced the progress of Christian thought, customs, and organization in the second century. With the exception of a part of the Shepherd of Hermas, the works of the Apostolic Fathers were written in Greek. They are available, however, in English translation and should be read by all who wish to be acquainted with the whole field of early Christian literature.[1]

Recapitulation.—We have noted what is meant by the term literature; we have seen that the Bible is a literature; we have listed the various types of literature it contains; we have observed the main divisions into which it falls, and the periods covered; we have seen that there is an apocryphal or non-canonical literature both of the Old and the New Testaments; we have discussed the interest and value of this Jewish and Christian literature outside the Bible. The most helpful and far-reaching principle one can get hold of in regard to the Bible is that it is a literature, and as a literature it tells us what other people of other times have done and thought, but not what we must think and do. That is something we have to find out for ourselves. Always, to be sure, we are to remember that it has in it the highest and best in religious thought and in

[1] See the *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, I, 1–149. This collection covers the literature produced by Christianity during the period following the New Testament writers down to 325 A.D. Of this literature the Apostolic Fathers form a small part.

inspiring characters. Being a reflection of the life in which it arose, however, it has a considerable element that is not up to modern ideas in science or ideals in religion. It is to be used, therefore, discriminatingly and not with a blanket assumption of infallibility.

Textual criticism.—The story of how the Bible was preserved, how it passed from one language into another, is one of fascinating interest. It is, of course, largely the same story as that of any ancient literature which has been preserved and translated so that we can read it now in English. The original, autograph manuscripts of Homer's *Iliad*, or of the works of Plato and Aristotle have been lost for centuries. So have those of the Psalmists and Isaiah, of the evangelists and Paul. Their works have been preserved by copying. The oldest manuscript of the New Testament is itself a copy made three or four hundred years after the books of the New Testament were written, and probably long after the original writings themselves had been lost or worn out. Thus we have no way of correcting the copies by the original. Scholars have, however, compared the manuscript copies with one another and by this means have determined as exactly as possible what the original wording was. As old manuscripts have been found from time to time, they have been examined with minute care and compared with those already

known. This study of ancient manuscripts is a science in itself. Its technical name is textual criticism, or the study of the text (for "criticism" means study), because its aim is to recover the original wording or text of the books of the Old and the New Testaments. Textual criticism is a science that deals not alone with the biblical books. There is a textual criticism of all ancient authors. The text of Caesar which is read in high school has been determined in the same way.

Historical criticism.—In addition to textual criticism, or the study of the Hebrew and Greek texts of the Bible, there is historical criticism, which attempts to discover the history that lies back of the original writings themselves, and the motives that controlled their authors. About thirty years ago this kind of study was called "higher criticism," to distinguish it from the lower or preparatory textual criticism.[1] We may say that it tries to trace the history of the books of the Bible higher, that is, beyond the words themselves to the situation that called forth the book, to the author's motive in writing it, and to the source of the ideas reflected in the book. The term "higher criticism" is practically obsolete now, and is used generally only in a jocular way, or by those who are ignorant of it or hostile to it. The correct name of this

[1] Cf. Nash, *A History of the Higher Criticism of the New Testament*, pp. 12–13.

science is "the historical criticism [or study] of the Bible." Those who practice historical criticism are said to use the historical method. Upon these two sciences, textual criticism and historical criticism, has been based all the progress made in recent years in scientific Bible-study. Through them the field of religion is made one with the other fields of knowledge to which the various sciences are devoted and through them religion and the Bible are made more intelligible and tenable to a modern educated man.

Sketch of the history of Bible translation.—The first translation of the Old Testament from its original Hebrew and Aramaic was made about 286–100 B.C., when it was translated into Greek. This version is called the Septuagint (Latin *septuaginta*, seventy), because it was said to have been made by seventy translators. Next it was translated into Syriac, probably before the Christian Era. Then the Old and the New Testaments were both translated into Latin and Coptic, the language of Northern Africa. About 400 A.D. Jerome made a translation of the whole Bible into Latin, basing his work on earlier translations into that language. Jerome's version is called the Vulgate, because it came into general use (Latin *vulgus*, the public). Various translations of the Bible into English were made before 1611, when the King James Version was made. Much of the English in this is quaint

and old-fashioned now; moreover, better Greek manuscripts have meanwhile been found, so that in 1881 a revision was made by a company of English and American scholars chosen for that task. The American Revised Version incorporates changes recommended by the American revisers and is probably the best version of the Bible in English yet made.[1] Of course the Bible has been translated into all other modern languages as well.

The Bible's real value.—The dictaphone is a machine into which business men sometimes dictate their letters. After words have been spoken into it, it will faithfully reproduce the words any number of times. The Bible is like that. Into it the great souls of Israel and of early Christianity poured their message, and with allowance made for the vicissitudes of copying and editing, it faithfully repeats that message even yet. But the Bible has often been thought of as if it were itself the speaker and its readers were the dictaphone, so that whatever it said they must say, whatever it thought they must think. The reader of the Bible is not a dictaphone to duplicate the thought processes of ages past, nor is he the stenographer who must copy what the dictaphone says: he is rather another

[1] A number of efforts have been made to improve upon this version, the latest being a version of the Old Testament issued by the Jewish Publication Society of Philadelphia. Other modern versions of the New Testament are Moffatt's, Weymouth's, and the Twentieth Century New Testament.

business man who must do his own thinking and speak his own message in the language and through the ideas of his own time. The principle that the Bible was given as a mold for the minds of men, though producing some good results, has wrought great damage to religion. It is the wedge that has caused every denominational split; it is used to justify the existence of every new sect. The hope of American Protestant Christianity is that people will finally become so clear as to realities and values that the spectacle of four churches in an American town of eight hundred inhabitants will be forever at an end. One great helping factor in the establishment of community churches in the place of denominational ones will be the recognition of the Bible as a literature, ancient, noble, inspiring, in many ways unsurpassed, but not to be thought of as intended to relieve us from the necessity of thinking for ourselves. To regard the Bible in that way is both to misuse it and to misunderstand the task God has set before us in the modern world.

CHAPTER III

THE WORLD JESUS LIVED IN

A sketch of Palestine's history.—To modern Christians perhaps the most interesting thing about Palestine is that Jesus lived there. But besides this, it has a fascinating history. As early as 1600 B.C. it was the home of peoples having an advanced civilization. Slowly conquered by the Hebrews, it came to be the fatherland of the Jew. In the course of centuries it has been swept again and again by battling armies. In 721 B.C. the northern division of the Hebrew kingdom, which had stood for over two hundred years, was conquered by the Assyrians, the capital, Samaria, destroyed, and the population, consisting of ten of the twelve tribes, deported to Mesopotamia. Interesting legends are told of these lost ten tribes, but no one knows what became of them. Probably they were absorbed by the Assyrians. The Southern Kingdom stood for one hundred and thirty-five years more, but was finally captured in 586 B.C. by the Babylonians. In the siege the Temple, which had been built by Solomon about 930 B.C., was destroyed. The people were transplanted to Babylonia. Fifty years later, the Babylonian empire had fallen, and Cyrus, its conqueror, permitted the

Jews to return to Palestine. Many preferred to stay in Babylon, their new home, but enough returned to build the second Temple, and later to rebuild the city walls. The Jews now remained for about one hundred and twenty years subject to Persia. When Alexander the Great conquered the then known world, Palestine, in 332 B.C., became subject to Macedonia. Later it was controlled by Syria. From 175–63 B.C. it was an independent state with a government of its own. At the time of Jesus' birth it had been for two generations subject to Rome. The third Temple, built by Herod the Great (begun 20 B.C., but not completed till 62 A.D.) had replaced the second Temple and is the one referred to occasionally in the New Testament. It was destroyed in 70 A.D. at the capture of Jerusalem by Titus.

Significance of Palestine.—Recent international events make it easier for us to see how Palestine could be thus passed around from one "power" to another. About 70 A.D. the Jews made a desperate revolt against Rome, but were defeated and Jerusalem destroyed. In 135 A.D. under a leader named Bar-Cochba they again attempted to free themselves from the Roman rule, but were completely crushed. When Rome had fallen and Mohammedanism, originating in Arabia, was sweeping a large part of the Mediterranean world, Palestine came under a new master, the Turk. It remained in his

power, with the exception of short periods during the Crusades, till 1918 when various parts of the country were captured by the British.

Though Palestine has always been small, it has never been insignificant. Greece, too, is a little country, the size of West Virginia, but it has put into history such great names as Homer, Demosthenes, Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Pericles, and many others. Palestine, also, has bred men whose names are well known far beyond its confines, Moses, Solomon, Elijah, Isaiah, Peter, Paul, and many more.

The life of Palestine as seen in the New Testament.—It was in this little, alert, oriental state that had known so many political changes that Jesus was born. It is impressive to think that in reading the New Testament we are reading the translation of words that were written in and near that little country eighteen hundred years ago. It faithfully represents the life of Palestine in the time of Jesus, though not in detail, for the writers refer to political and social conditions only incidentally, as these bear on their message. Everywhere, however, there is the background of Roman power, the emperor, the provincial governors, the soldiery, everywhere the Jewish religion, the Temple, the sects, Scribe and Pharisee, Sadducee, Essene, and Zealot, the curious Jewish customs and meticulous ceremonies, everywhere there is the open, out-door, sunny life of an oriental country.

The world of Jesus.—But a man's world is made up, not of the whole complex of things about him, but of the things that seize his thought. What does not secure his attention does not exist for him, while the things on which his thought dwells, even though they have no external existence, are realities to him.[1] The influences that shape character may be classified under the headings of heredity, environment, and personal acts and decisions. Everything that affects a person's character and life come from one of these three. Often the last overcomes the other two, and a man who has been unfortunate in his birth or environment yet lives his life nobly. Environments vary and people react differently to the same environment. "Two men looked through prison bars; One saw mud, the

[1] Members of the discussion group should agree in advance upon the topic each will give attention to, and search the gospels to find instances. Thus one member may take the references to nature in Mark, another in Matthew, a third in Luke. In the same way search may be made for allusions to various kinds of work and business, etc., mentioned in the gospels. Remember the important thing is that we shall study deeply the New Testament itself. It is the lasting literature. All commentaries and handbooks upon it have proved of comparatively temporary significance, but the New Testament has stood for centuries. The best help is one that piques our curiosity, provokes resistance, and leads us to examine the New Testament for ourselves. Do not imagine that because another person does not agree with you he is not helping you, or you him. You are each whetting the other's mind. Think hard, speak modestly but candidly, and above all, keep smiling.

other stars." We propose to gather the hints scattered through the gospels as to what made up Jesus' environment, the world he lived in. We find references to show that his world was made up of:

1. Nature: sea, mountains, birds, plants, flowers, lightning, storm.

2. Family relationships: father, mother, brothers, sisters (there were nine in Jesus' family).

3. Kinds of work and business: farming, fishing, clerical work, mercantile business, building, carpentry, household work.

4. Social classes: political officials, religious sects and teachers, soldiers, disciples, friends, enemies, rich men, beggars, the sick, women, the public.

5. Religious institutions: the Mosaic Law, the Old Testament, the Sabbath, the Temple, synagogues.

6. Social customs: meals, weddings, footwashing, feasts, slavery, divorce.

7. Commonplace things: yeast, salt, lamps, sheep, dogs, donkeys, chickens, camels, insects, country, villages, cities, houses, a garden.

8. Human experiences: war, debt, marriage, poverty, sickness, weariness, hunger, pain, death, mourning, burial.

9. Supernatural agencies: angels, demons, Satan, God, miracles.

Present-day thinking as regards supernatural evil agencies.—In the discussion of the ninth point, concerning the evidence as to angels, demons, and Satan, some questions always come up on which minds work differently. To many Christians angels, demons, and even Satan have become unreal. To refer epilepsy, or insanity, or loss of speech, or any other disease to demon-possession would seem to them a retrogression to the primitive ideas of savages who employ witch doctors to call forth the evil spirits from the sick. They do not feel the necessity of assuming the existence of these supernatural agencies as they do feel the necessity of assuming the existence of God. Observation, reading, education, reflection, and experience have led them to believe in God; they are not led to the same conclusion about angels, demons, and Satan. They are inclined to class these with other creatures of the imagination, for example, the Irish banshees, the Scotch fairies, the Puritan witches, the negro voodoo and "hants." They know that the belief in a thing, however vital it may have been to those who held that belief, is no proof that that thing ever actually existed. The ancient Greeks, for example, had a complex system of gods and goddesses with stories about them worked out in elaborate detail, yet no one believes now that a single one of those gods and goddesses ever existed outside the people's imagination. Even the present-day Greeks them-

selves, though they are proud of this wonderful past and its literature, do not think of Zeus, Hera, Heracles, Apollo, Aphrodite, and all the rest as having ever really existed. That is, they did not exist as the mountains, rivers, seas, etc., connected with their adventures existed. They were made by thinking, and they existed only in thought. Epictetus, a Stoic philosopher of the first century, remarks that things appear to our minds in four ways:

1. They exist and appear to exist.
2. They do not exist, and do not appear to exist.
3. They exist, but do not appear to exist.
4. They do not exist, but appear to exist.

Many thoughtful and religious people would now put angels, demons, and Satan under number 2 above, though they would acknowledge that for ancient peoples they belonged under number 4, and really seemed to them to belong under number 1.

The view of early Christian times.—It is not difficult to find evidence outside the New Testament as to what the Jewish people were thinking about demons in those days. Josephus was writing his history about the same time the books of the New Testament were being written. In the following passage from the seventh book of his *Jewish War* he tells both what demons were and how people who had demons could be cured by the use of the root of a certain tree. He tells how the

tree looked, how hard it was to get the root of it, what the power of the root was, and what demons themselves are, as follows:

> Its color is like to that of flame, and toward the evening it sends out a certain ray like lightning; it is not easily taken by such as would do it, but recedes from their hands, nor will yield itself to be taken quietly until either the urine of a woman, or blood, be poured upon it; nay, even then it is certain death to those that touch it, unless anyone take and hang the root itself down from his hand, and so carry it away. It may also be taken in another way without danger, which is this: they dig a trench quite round about it till the hidden part of the root be very small, they then tie a dog to it, and when the dog tries hard to follow him that tied him, this root is easily plucked up, but the dog dies immediately, as if it were instead of the man that would take the plant away; nor after this need anyone be afraid of taking it into his hands. Yet after all this pains in getting, it is only valuable on account of one virtue it hath, that if it be only brought to sick persons, it quickly drives away those called demons, which are no other than the spirits of the wicked, that enter into men that are alive and kill them unless they can obtain some help against them (*War*, vii. 6).

Josephus also tells in his *Antiquities of the Jews*, Book viii, of Eleazar, a Jew, who cured those who had demons by means of a ring. He would put this ring to the sick man's nose and draw the demon out through his nostrils. In the same passage Josephus says that Solomon learned the science of casting out demons and that he composed incantations to be used for that purpose. Some of the

incantations thus used by Jewish exorcists have been preserved to the present day.[1]

Types of reaction to the topic "demons."—We who are loyal to Jesus Christ and wish to win men to his plan of life are bound to face the contrast between the large place which the gospels give to angels, demons, and Satan in the life of Jesus, and the small place which these commonly have in the lives of even his most cordial admirers today. Many young people have wished for light on this question which neither the sermon nor the Sunday school has given them.

In discussion men generally sort out as follows:

1. Some say that Jesus knew that demons, etc., did not exist. In his own mind he put them under number 2 of Epictetus' classification. But he knew that the people all about him did believe in them, and he accommodated himself to their views and spoke and acted as if he shared their belief.

2. Some say that Jesus knew that demons, etc., did not exist, and he made no pretense at believing in them. All that the gospels tell us about him which would make us think he did, comes not from Jesus, but from the writers of the gospels. That is, they did believe in demons, etc., and they read back their own ideas into Jesus' life and put into his mouth such words as they thought he would have

[1] For the text of one found in Africa dating from the third century see Blau, *Das alt-jüdische Zauberwesen*, pp. 97 ff.

spoken and such deeds as they thought he would have done.

3. Some say that Jesus actually did believe in demons, etc., that in this respect he shared the ideas of the people about him. Of those who hold this view there are two classes: (*a*) Those who themselves believe that demons, etc., actually exist. (*b*) Those who themselves do not believe that demons, etc., exist.

Those who place themselves in class (*a*) usually do so because of a supposed loyalty to Jesus and the New Testament. Those who place themselves in class (*b*) feel that they are equally loyal to Jesus, and to the New Testament. They think that loyalty to Jesus does not involve a copying of all the details of his thought any more than it means a duplicating of his language or his dress. They hold that to be loyal to Jesus is to revere his character and live on his principle.[1]

Views about miracles.—It is much the same with the subject of miracles. Opinions will differ, and the leader and the members of the group should be prepared both to expect difference and to respect it. The conviction that the universe in all its parts acts and reacts in ways of unvarying regularity, which is a by-product of modern scientific education, has not yet reached by any means all persons.

[1] For fuller discussion see the author's article, "Did Jesus Believe in Demons?" *Biblical World*, July, 1920, pp. 371–77.

There may be—and should be—some in the discussion group who have not studied in high school or college and consequently have not had the incentive to readjustment. On the other hand, some who have had scientific training have not been led to see its implications, or have managed to keep their scientific and their religious thinking apart, in separate compartments of the brain, as it were, and so have not allowed their culture to modify their religious views. Others, again, have been systematically trained to suspicion and opposition to scientific views and imagine that their adoption means the loss of personal religion and the destruction of Christianity.

With such antecedent experiences, difference of opinion is inevitable. Some will say that no miracle ever happened. Others will argue that all things are possible with God. Others will reply that it is not a question of possibility, but one of probability. That God could interfere with the regular processes of nature in order to impress people with his power, or to increase the prestige of some religious leader, or to deliver his worshipers from danger or difficulty, or to relieve suffering or disability, they are willing to admit, but that he has ever done so, they regard as very improbable. They find it easier to explain the rise of the miracle narratives of the New Testament by attributing them to the creative religious imagination of the

early Christian group than by supposing that they are in all respects sober statements of fact. Others will contend, as was held widely a century ago, that the miracles are a vital part of Christianity, being the God-given credentials of its divine origin[1] and making it separate from and superior to any other religion. Often, also, the attempt will be made to force the false alternative that one must either take the New Testament as a whole as wholly correct or discard it altogether. Still others will take a mediating position and hold that many of the miracles of Jesus are explainable on the supposition that Jesus was a powerful hypnotist, himself probably of commanding presence and robust health. To such a man, in addition a popular religious hero, many of the gospel miracles would be possible. Healers of this type appear frequently. Perhaps some members of the group will know of one or more. Moreover, the cures effected by visits to relics and shrines, like the church of St. Anne de Beau Pre in Canada, are a proof of the effects that can be wrought by purely psychological means. To explain the miracles that lie beyond this type, such as the walking on the water, the feeding of the five thousand, and the raising of the dead, it is assumed that the story is an outgrowth of some incident, or of some teaching of Jesus, exaggerated by pious

[1] As was argued elaborately by William Paley (1743–1805) n his famous book *The Evidences of the Christian Religion.*

fancy, as it was told and retold, into the statement as it now stands in the gospels.

The discussion group's essential.—A view to which all will agree is not likely to come out of the discussion of this topic. But unanimity of opinion is by no means so desirable as is often supposed. It may in fact be a hindrance to progress. What is desirable in the discussion group is candor, courtesy, free expression, good temper, a willingness to see all sides of a problem, and respect for those who differ from us. Above all, we should beware of regarding a person whose opinion on these points differs from ours as not a Christian. Even on points like these equally good Christian people differ. This in itself shows that it is a matter of opinion, not of character. Moreover, our task as a discussion group is not to get people to hold opinions that duplicate our own, but to strengthen good character through the clearing up of our own thinking, the sharing of information, participation in discussion, and the learning of the opinions of others. We are to remember that as a rule people think what they have been taught to think. Your teaching has been different from another's, and you think differently.

People: a factor in Jesus' world.—Though Jesus' thought world contained these supernatural agencies of evil which are not now a part of normal experience, it contained two other factors that are

real to us, men and God. He was not a hermit as many of his followers have been; he went about freely among men, sharing his message generously, entering heartily into their life. Notice how rarely you read of Jesus being alone. Notice how he says in Matt. 11:19 and Luke 7:34 that his free and easy way of living had been contrasted unfavorably with John the Baptist's strictness. Jesus has been claimed as a great democrat, as a labor agitator, as a socialist, as a religious revolutionist, but it is always something that has to do with men. Jesus was a mixer. He was always interested in men, and it was a genuine, not a professional, interest. Have you never met the professional handshake, with its gentle pull to get you out of the way, the professional smile, the professional small talk with its obvious "put on"? As Christians we must have a genuine affection for others. Disinterested interest is one of the last products of religion. Under the influence of a hypnotic evangelist people have often been wrought into a frenzy of anxiety over others. But such things are transient by-products. The grand effect of the Christian religion is to make us interested in people, not because they are possible converts to our coterie, but because they are people. When biblical scholarship reaches its higher stages it ceases to be denominational; and when religion reaches its higher stages it ceases to be sectarian. Its interests

are no longer ecclesiastical, they are human. Every act of kindness to man or beast is true religion, and every time one human being helps another he has that far followed Christ.

God: the supreme person in Jesus' world.— The last, greatest factor of Jesus' world was God. We cannot enter into the inner shrine of Jesus' devotional life as we can with some others. He left no elaborate descriptions of religious raptures such as were written by Madam Guyon, Samuel Rutherford, Jonathan Edwards, and others of the mystics. Jesus left no detailed statement of his doctrine of God such as were formed by the creed-making councils of the fourth century, and by Thomas Aquinas, John Calvin, and others who have drawn up systems of theology. But the gospels show that Jesus lived with God, and we gather that it was from this fact that his life gained its peculiar projective power. We of today have the same chance to live our lives with God. It will not make another Jesus of everyone to keep the morning watch, and read the New Testament daily, and think often about God, but it will connect one with the source of power Jesus employed. It will add a subtle sympathy and grasp of situations, a freedom from fear, a hold on one's self; it will make one master in circumstances one can control, and keep one's nerve unshaken where control is not in one's power.

God in our world.—There is reason to believe that we live enveloped by a power that is constantly willing us good. Experience has shown us over and over again that this power has brought to us better things than we had planned. Disappointment, chagrin, temporary defeat, uncertainty, sickness, sorrow, poverty, wounds, disablements, always bring their after-proofs that God is good. Time and again we have seen men in moments of indecision and depression, not able to see the way out, and they came off better than they had expected. These things teach us that God can be depended upon. Before a man has learned to swim, when he is told that the water will hold him up, he doubts it, but when he has learned, he tells others the same thing. Before, he had thought of water as an uncertain, dangerous element, whose function was to let people sink, now he thinks of it as a steady, dependable element, whose function is to delight and refresh people and sustain them from sinking. God is like water, air, always dependable, always there. We live at our best when we build our days with him. Reliance on self is a wonderful quality—reliance on God is, too. Consider Isa. 50:10, "He that walketh in darkness and hath no light, let him trust in the name of Jehovah, and rely upon his God." Jesus knew, as any man may learn, that God can be relied upon. We cannot make him our slave or wheedle him into giving us

what we want for the asking, but we can know that he is always all about us steadily willing that the right shall win, always wishing us the best. God will not make the world right, but he will help us make it right. He will not give us without our effort days free from sin, but he will help us in our fight for such days. God helps men to help themselves, and he who fails to take God into his life loses much of joy and power.

We have considered the world Jesus lived in as to its historical setting and its constituent elements. We have noted its similarities to and its difference from our own. By this day's discussion we approach a step nearer to Jesus as he was and gain an added inspiration to repeat his sort of life in the world we live in.

CHAPTER IV

THE IMPORTANCE AND THE DIFFICULTY OF KNOWING WHAT JESUS TAUGHT

Three reasons for its importance.—Historically, personally, and for purposes of propaganda, the recovering of the teaching of Jesus is important. Historically, for the whole Christian movement began with him, and his ideas. Though there are now some five hundred millions of Christians in the world, there was a time when Christianity lay like a seed germ in the thought of one man. Personally, for to bring our own minds into contact with the original, powerful ideas of Jesus ought to produce in us something of the same enthusiasm and devotion which they produced in the case of his disciples, and develop in us the same type of life Jesus himself lived. For purposes of propaganda, because it always helps to carry conviction if we are able to quote some great leader such as Lincoln or Roosevelt or Washington in support of what we say. Much more so in religious matters, if a man is able to say upon any subject, "This was Jesus' idea, this is what Jesus taught." He has something which not only strengthens conviction within himself, but often carries it with others.

GENERAL DIFFICULTY: THE NECESSITY OF USING A BOOK

But, though the recovering of Jesus' precise teaching is important, it is not easy. Thought is sometimes not understood or is misunderstood even when it is put in spoken words, with the expressions of the face and the inflections of the voice to help make it clear. The gospels state more than once (Mark 9:32; Luke 2:50; John 10:6; 12:6; Matt. 15:15; Mark 4:10; search will find other passages also) that Jesus' own disciples, and even his own parents, sometimes failed to get his meaning. But when the helps of voice, and gesture, and eye, and face are gone, and we must dig out a man's thought from words in a book, the danger of misunderstanding him is even greater.

SPECIAL DIFFICULTIES

Moreover, in the task of restating what Jesus taught we have to work against a number of special difficulties.

1. Meager source material.—There is the comparative scarcity of source material. Jesus himself, so far as we know, wrote nothing. Though an enormous number of books have been written about Jesus, we have practically only four, the gospels, that give us any original information concerning him. But these four are very small books. Mark has only 16 chapters, Matthew 28, Luke 24,

John 21. Printed in a newspaper they would altogether cover only eight pages. (The whole New Testament would cover only eighteen pages.)

An even closer limitation is necessary. The first three gospels are much alike, while the fourth, John, stands in a class by itself. The difference between it and the others is so great that in restating Jesus' thought it is best not to try to combine it with the others, but to study it separately. In these discussions we shall stick generally to the gospels of Mark, Matthew, and Luke, leaving the thought of Jesus as represented in the Fourth Gospel to be taken up at some other time.

We must shorten the diameter of our circle again, for the three gospels, Mark, Matthew, Luke, give only a part of their space to recording what Jesus taught. They give a good deal of it to what Jesus did, what other people thought about Jesus, and what they did to him. The great events in the life of Jesus with which we are most familiar are not teaching, but action. Underscore in Mark every word assigned to Jesus, and you can read them all without hurry in twenty-two minutes. The scantiness of original material regarding Jesus' teaching becomes more impressive when one thinks of the abundance we have for studying that of other men of that general period. Josephus wrote two works, each larger, not only than the four gospels, but larger than the whole New Testament; Philo

had written even more fully; Seneca in Latin and Arrian's report of the teaching of Epictetus in Greek are larger than our sources for the teaching of Jesus. Plutarch is larger still, while Galen, a Greek physician born a century after Jesus' death, has left us twenty fat volumes. It is evident that in our study of the thought of Jesus we must reckon upon an extraordinary shortage of material.

2. **His teaching not in English.**—Jesus taught in a language which to us is foreign. People do not always think of this, especially when they are stickling for some particular word or phrase in the English New Testament. Jesus did not speak English. There is a story told of an old woman who refused to read the Bible except in the King James Version, because, she said, "What was good enough for the Apostle Paul is good enough for me." But tell this story in almost any group and you will see a number of puzzled faces. That means that a number have not seen the point, for they have never thought that Paul did not speak English, and that the King James translation was not made for more than 1,500 years after Paul's time. In the same way men often do not think that Jesus spoke his own language, not ours.

3. **His teaching not in Greek.**—Jesus spoke in a language different from that in which the gospels are written. He spoke in Aramaic, but the gospels, as well as all the other books of the New Testament,

are written in Greek. This means that even in the original gospels we have not the actual words Jesus used. The scholar reads them at second-hand, and when we read our English New Testament we read them at third-hand after they have passed through two translations. This, of course, does not necessarily detract from their value, but it is a fact we ought not to ignore.

4. The report colored by doctrinal considerations.—The gospels give us not merely the teaching *of* Jesus, but the teaching *about* Jesus, that is, they represent the belief of the early church about him. Into this belief by the time the gospels were written, forty to seventy years after Jesus' death, many miraculous and legendary elements had entered. The gospel stories advance regularly from simplicity to complexity. Matthew and Luke add features that are not included in Mark's earlier gospel.

5. The interweaving of documents.—The difficulty in recovering the exact teaching of Jesus is increased by the composite make-up of the gospels. Matthew and Luke used Mark; they used several other documents as well. Scholars have worked patiently for a hundred years on the literary relationships of the gospels to each other and to their sources. One of the best studies finds not less than eight documents to have been used.[1] To sort

[1] Professor Ernest De Witt Burton's *Some Principles of Literary Criticism and Their Application to the Synoptic Problem.*

out the teaching of Jesus in its earliest form is not easy.

6. Traditional religious ideas.—Ideas and phrases connected with Jesus absorbed from others often make it difficult for us to think clearly about him. Just as there was a certain picture of Jesus current among the Christians when the New Testament was being written, so there was a certain conception of him current in the group in which we grew up, or in which we have lived and studied. This conception will affect our idea of what Jesus' teaching was. Some men in discussion will assert that Jesus knew all about the Great War, or that he understood the mechanism of aeroplanes, others will think he did not know such things. Do not let the views you are familiar with keep you from a fair-minded attempt to rediscover Jesus for yourself.

7. Antiquity.—The immense distance in time that separates us from Jesus makes it difficult for us to get hold of exactly what he taught. Many people are not accustomed to think over long spaces. Back of the period of their own lives and those of their father's or grandfather's, all dates, events, and characters telescope into an uncertain perspective. This is especially true of Bible characters and events. Was Moses before or after the Flood? Who lived first, Elijah or Methusaleh? It is not easy to realize that between us and Jesus

lie nineteen centuries. Into our thought of Jesus there sift down bits of all that men have thought about him in all that time. Much of that thought was not based upon unbiased study of his teaching. Within the last few years students of the Bible have been paying more attention to Jesus himself, and what he taught, than for ages before. They are saying, like the Greeks in the twelfth chapter of John, "Sir, we would see Jesus." Heretofore they have had held up to them a church, or a belief, or Paul, or even a sickly, anemic, dehumanized portrait of Christ. Now they want to know Jesus as he was. That is the spirit of these discussions. There must have been a tremendous drive about Jesus to have set such a movement going. There must have been in his thought a revolutionary force. It is that which we want to discover. Jesus has often been pragmatized, that is, his sanction has been claimed for various modern ideas. An appeal to one's conscience to say what ought to be done under given circumstances has been masked under the question, "What would Jesus do?" When thought out clearly, this question is seen to mean, "What will I do, if I do right?" In our study of Jesus' teaching, we shall seek to find only what is there.

Summary.—We have enumerated the factors that make a recovery of Jesus' teaching difficult. He spoke a foreign language; his teaching as it

stands in the gospels is already a translation; the writers have the early church view, which they are anxious to preserve and propagate; the gospels are not simple, straightaway compositions, but are made by putting together source documents; our traditional conceptions, and the immense space of time that separates us from Jesus, all combine to increase the difficulty of restating what he taught.

POSSIBILITY AND METHOD OF KNOWING WHAT JESUS TAUGHT

But to acknowledge the difficulty is not to deny the possibility. Anyone who can read the gospels can get a fair idea of what Jesus stood for. Moreover, in the gospels he has all there is to know. Nobody has any more. If anyone wishes to know what Jesus taught, he has only to read what he said, use his own mind, and put two and two together. He may make mistakes, but there is no other way to get ahead. The sooner a man learns that he has to make his own religion, do his own thinking, the better. Progress is made by thinking hard, discussing candidly and kindly, and trying out our ideas in experience. Nothing exists by divine right, but by right of its proved value in human life. We are anxious to know what Jesus thought even, not because it will excuse us from thinking for ourselves, but because it will stimulate and help us in our thinking. More important than

Jesus' thought is Jesus' spirit, his type of living. But back of a man's acts are his thoughts, and in finding what Jesus taught, difficult though the task is, we shall find the secret of his "wonderful way of living."

VARIOUS APPROACHES TO THE STUDY OF JESUS' TEACHING

As people have studied the Bible in general from different motives, so their ways of approach to the study of the character and teaching of Jesus have been different. Some of these may here be gathered together.

1. **The theological approach.**—Some come with an elaborately worked out scheme of theology, which they have taken over bodily from the past. They know in detail the whole of God's plan for the human race from Adam to the day of judgment. In this scheme Jesus has his place. Their study of the gospels is likely to be directed toward fitting the gospel statements into this highly artificial system. Coupled with this there is likely to be a theory as to the character of the gospels themselves which makes any free inquiry impossible. Moreover, the teaching of Jesus is largely ignored because of its inadaptability as theological material. In many of the things that commonly have interested Christian theologians Jesus was not interested, or at least we have no record of his talk about them. Consequently those who approach the study of

Jesus with a theological interest are much more likely to emphasize his death than his life, and to substitute their own or their denomination's teaching about Jesus for the things he is reported actually to have said. The study of Jesus' own teaching reveals the astonishing fact that almost without exception every link in the chain of the so-called "plan of salvation" is missing. Where did men get their idea that in the beginning God created a perfect human pair, that they sinned and somehow made all their descendants sinners, that to offset this God sent Jesus to die, so that men might be forgiven? Not from Jesus! The things we hear in church and evangelistic services are mainly things that Jesus never speaks of.

2. The historical approach.—Here the student attacks the study of Jesus' life and teaching as a historical problem. He applies the same reasoning he would apply in any other case. He tries to ascertain precisely what Jesus taught, as well as when he lived and what he did. He seeks only to learn the facts. From his findings opinions may be drawn, but that is not his task. He is to examine critically and report faithfully what he finds. Within the last century this approach has been used more and more, and to its use has been due the progress made in Bible-study. From it arises the next method of approach, that which is presupposed in these discussions.

3. **The practical approach.**—Here we study Jesus and his teaching to find what were the powerful factors in his life. We want to see how he met his problems, how he worked out his principle of action, what his controlling ideas were, how he backed them up with his life. Then we shall understand what it was that gave him his great power, and we shall go out with enthusiasm to live on his plan, with faith that it is truly through him that we, ourselves, and all the world are to be saved.

CHAPTER V

WHAT JESUS TAUGHT ABOUT CIVILIZATION

The meaning of "civilization."—The term civilization, as we commonly use it, means the sum total of the phenomena of a nation's life at any given period. Civilization includes a nation's government, its industries, its education, its popular customs and beliefs. In short a nation's civilization is the way that nation lives. Thus we speak of the ancient civilizations of Egypt, Babylon, and Crete, of Etruria, Greece, and Rome, meaning thereby all that these ancient peoples were accustomed to do and think. Civilizations of different nations differ, and the civilization of the same nation differs at different times. We think of the civilization of colonial days in the United States as marked by spinning wheels, backlogs, flint-lock muskets, Indian fighting, witchcraft, stagecoaches, cold meetinghouses, long sermons, blue laws, and Calvinistic theology. A catalogue of the marks of American civilization at present would be very different.

The making of civilization.—The result of the interaction of a nation's civilization and its natural genius is the national character. The elements of heredity, environment, and personal decision make

nations, just as they make men. Consider, for example, how a nation's life is affected by geography, climate, and the civilization of surrounding nations. Put new factors into a nation's life, and you change its civilization and ultimately its character. Herein lies the great responsibility of the men who make the laws, who decide the subjects to be taught in schools and colleges, who shape the policies of corporations, newspapers, lodges, denominations, and influential organizations of every kind. Think how one decision of the government, one command of an officer, may change lives. The future of a family, a community, a county, a state, a nation may be altered by a single decision. But while it is interesting to think of the heavy responsibility that some carry, there is no one of sound mind who is free from it. We are all makers of civilization. The future depends upon everyone's doing his part.

Marks of an ideal civilization.—Pool ideas in the discussion group as to what the characteristics of a perfect civilization would be. Every member can furnish at least ten. From the different suggestions a list of thirty or more items will emerge. Many of these will be a direct outgrowth of some one of the principles of Jesus. For example, among others in discussion groups conducted by the author, there have been mentioned democratic government, compulsory, universal, free education,

elimination of child labor, abolition of saloons, equal suffrage, simplification of court procedure, profit sharing, separation of church and state, sanitation, doing away with sweatshops and unhealthy tenements, church union, and the prevalence everywhere of the spirit of kindliness, human interest, reverence for God and the significance of human life.

The civilization of Jesus' time.—Jesus lived in the midst of a civilization which was Jewish with an admixture of elements from two of the greatest civilizations of antiquity, Greece and Rome, whose institutions, history, language, and literature furnish a large part of the materials of education. His was one of the "little peoples" and had been handed about from one "power" to another. It had been influenced by all, but had kept its own character, as the Jews have even to this day, when the "powers" that bandied them about have all crumbled into dust. Was Jesus satisfied with the civilization of his time? Or did he see the vision of a different and better one?

Jesus' ideal of civilization: the Kingdom of God.—As it stands in the Synoptic Gospels, a large part of Jesus' teaching was about a civilization whose type we shall discover gradually as we go on. In naming this civilization Jesus used a term already in use and familiar to his hearers. He called it the "Kingdom of God." In the first three gospels he mentions it directly over one hun-

dred times. He would tell some story, using things, events, and people familiar to his hearers, sometimes leaving them to draw their own conclusions, sometimes showing how the story was like some feature of the new civilization. In this way he described its rise and growth, the character of the Kingdom-people, and the way the Kingdom was finally to be set up in the world. We shall read Mark, Matthew, and Luke through and see how often Jesus referred to the Kingdom and how we can gather from what he said what his thought about it was.

Method to be followed in studying Jesus' ideal civilization.—In discovering what Jesus taught upon the subjects we shall study, our plan of procedure will be as follows:

1. To search through the Gospel of Mark for material on the topic under discussion.

2. To reduce the material found to summary statements in our own words.

3. To assemble these in a composite statement which shall give us the total teaching of Jesus on the topic as that teaching is recorded by Mark.

4. To apply the same processes to Matthew and Luke.

5. To combine these three composite statements into a final one, which will put before us Jesus' entire teaching on the subject in hand as the Synoptic Gospels present it.

This method has certain faults, but also certain advantages, and these advantages, it is believed, justify its adoption:

a) It is simple. Where this form of Bible-study has been used it has been quickly grasped and has been followed with keen interest, because the student understood at once how to go to work.

b) It is heuristic. No type of teaching is more enjoyable than that which allows us to discover things for ourselves, under competent guidance. The heuristic method is an approved pedagogical device.

c) It is thoroughgoing. By setting a group of alert minds at work searching a single gospel for material on a single topic, the chances of omission of any pertinent material are reduced.

d) It is convincing. Instead of employing selected passages to support a claim—which is a familiar method, but which leaves one with a query as to whether there may not have been some omission of adverse passages—this plan brings every available bit of evidence into the argument and leaves the investigator with a sense of sureness and completeness of grasp of the material.

e) It is the natural method. The way which would occur to anyone who wished to find what a given book said on a given subject would be to read the book and make note of its statements regarding the subject in which he was interested. It applies,

then, to the gospels a method which one would naturally apply to any other book.

f) It is a method whose use requires no special training. Inasmuch as discussion groups are made up of persons who in many cases have no experience in the critical processes employed by biblical scholarship, this method commends itself because any intelligent person can use it profitably, regardless of his previous lack of training. Of course, the keener minded the student is, the more he will be able to profit by its use.

To some the plan adopted may seem objectionable because it takes an uncritical attitude and reckons as correctly representing Jesus whatever the gospels studied record him as teaching. On this basis some things have to be attributed to Jesus which one would rather charge to someone else's account. One would naturally hesitate to attribute to Jesus anything that would seem unworthy of him, even though one were to find such discreditable statements in the gospels themselves.[1]

[1] For examples of statements which may be so considered, see Mark 4:12, the use of parables to obscure his teaching; 7:27, race prejudice; 7:33 and 8:23, hocus pocus; 9:29 and many other passages throughout the gospels, belief in demons; 11:13, 14, petulance; 12:26–27, rabbinical reasoning; 9:1 and parallels, mistaken expectation; chap. 13, Matthew, chap. 24, Luke, chap. 21, apocalypticism; Matt. 10:5, limitation of the disciples to work among Jews; 11:11, overstatement; 16:19, conferring of priestly powers; 19:28, Luke 23:30, sharing in crude apocalyptic ideas; Matt. 18:19; 21:21–22, fanatical religious views.

New Testament scholars have found various ways of meeting this difficulty:

a) One is, adopting Matthew Arnold's famous epigram, "Jesus stands head and shoulders above his reporters," to ascribe to Jesus such of his teaching as we conceive could have come from no one else. All the rest is negligible, as representing only the mistaken notions of the "reporters." Obviously this is to introduce a wholly subjective criticism. By it one does not square one's conception of Jesus by the gospels, but squares the gospels to the conception of Jesus which one already has. Such a plan would not be a fair or satisfactory one to adopt with a discussion group.

b) Another method is to separate, by a process of literary analysis, the Synoptic Gospels into the several documents of which they are composed, thus making comparison and relative dating possible. By this means Jesus may be relieved, for example, of some of the material which ascribes to him apocalyptic ideas, such as, e.g., that the Kingdom was to be established within a generation by his own return from the sky, accompanied by thousands of angels, the setting up of a day of universal judgment, when he and the Twelve would arbitrate the eternal destiny of all humanity, they judging the Jews (Matt. 19:28; Luke 22:30) and he the Gentiles (Matt. 25:32), and that a part of the Kingdom joy would be in eating and drinking

(Luke 22:29–30; 22:18; Mark 14:25; Matt. 26:29). These ideas correspond so closely to what we know from other parts of the New Testament were the notions prevalent in the primitive church that it is not unreasonable to suppose that there may have been on the part of the gospel writers an unconscious coloring of the purely spiritual teachings of Jesus with these cruder conceptions brought over from previous Jewish messianic expectations. If one is able by analysis to distinguish gospel documents which attribute to Jesus a religious and ethical message free from apocalyptic corruption, this supposition becomes the more probable. The reason for not adopting this method in the present studies is that most of those for whom they are intended are not versed in the niceties of synoptic criticism. Moreover unanimity of opinion on these points is lacking among those who are. For our purpose, therefore, a more rough-and-ready method seems preferable.

Moreover, it is not impossible that the gospels are correct in their representations of Jesus' teaching. Though it is a bold suggestion, it is not an incredible one that Jesus may have done his epoch-making thinking inside, so to speak, an apocalyptic framework. It is inevitable that every thinker should adopt certain assumptions, either devising them for himself or adopting or modifying those that have previously been held or are current in his

day. As a rule, these assumptions come out of the thinker's environment, being furnished by the movement of which he is a part. To him and to those directly influenced by him these ideas are likely to seem unquestionable. The value of his contribution to world-life is not, however, dependent on their being so. Even with assumptions that are later disproved, a system of thought may be erected that contains invaluable elements of beauty and truth.

In connection with Jesus' teaching about the Kingdom we encounter some of the passages most difficult to reconcile with our traditional conceptions of him, or with other statements of the gospels. But in it, too, we find some of the completest of his delineations of ideal character and life. In our gathering of the material which the gospels give we shall omit nothing, but if our discussion is to be of the most value we shall need to emphasize not so much the apocalyptic framework, which after all corresponds to the mason's scaffolding, as the noble and inspiring teachings that are built up along with it.

THE TEACHING IN MARK

Summary of Mark's report.—In Mark, Jesus speaks directly of the Kingdom of God thirteen times. The passages are as follows: 1:15; 4:11, 26, 30; 9:1, 47; 10:14, 15, 23, 24, 25; 12:34; 14:25. These passages show that Jesus thought that the new civilization had had to wait until a certain

time before it would be set up, but that the time had now arrived (1:15). He regarded himself and his disciples as having a special understanding of the Kingdom which outsiders did not share (4:11). The Kingdom is to grow, grow mysteriously, and have a sudden, spectacular climax (4:26). It will begin in a small way, but increase to gigantic size (4:30). The sudden, spectacular climax Jesus thinks of as coming within a few years (9:1). To win membership in the Kingdom one should be willing to sacrifice a hand or an eye. Those who do not get into the Kingdom go into the discard (Gehenna was the city dump) (9:47). The Kingdom-people are simple, unaffected, natural (10:14, 15). Rich men have a hard time to get into the Kingdom at all. Note how surprised the disciples are. They were used to thinking, like us, that a rich man can have anything he wants! (10:23, 24, 25.) To a man who saw that simple love to God and man is more than religious pomp and ceremony, Jesus said, "You are not far from the Kingdom." However, though evidently such simple love was to be the religion of the Kingdom, Jesus demanded more than that a man agree with his ideas in a theoretical way (12:34). Jesus at the Last Supper says he has taken his last taste of wine until the Kingdom has come (14:25).

Recapitulation.—This is all. Mark does not anywhere give us a detailed outline of what the

Kingdom meant. By piecing together these hints, however, we get a fairly complete picture of what Jesus taught. It was the old Jewish conception of the Kingdom of God, but with none of the extravagant statements about it that had sometimes been made (see Isa. 11:6–9 for a description of the taming of the wild animals when the Messiah should come). God was going to set up the Kingdom immediately. It would increase from an insignificant beginning to enormous size. It would be completed by his own return in a few years with hosts of angels. Not all (Jews) are to be in the Kingdom. Not all are fitted to be members of it. To the unfitted his parables throw darkness instead of light upon his teaching. A man ought to go to any length to overcome the obstacle that would keep him out of the Kingdom. Wealth is one of the obstacles. Repentance, simplicity, sincerity, and love are the marks of Kingdom-men. So sure does Jesus feel of the program of the future that he takes a vow not to taste wine again until he drinks it in the Kingdom. Even at the end of his life, then, the Kingdom is still something future to Jesus. Yet there is nothing to indicate that he thought of it as a state of being after death; he believed that though it would not come during his lifetime, it would come during his generation.

Evaluation.—What are the elements here that are available to us? Clearly not the time element,

for already not less than one generation, but more than sixty generations have passed away. Not the national element, for we can have no interest now in an ancient dream of a Jewish empire or even of a world-Judaism. Not in its spectacular climax, for history indicates that the world is to be brought to an ideal state by patient, long-continued improvement, wrought out by men, rather than by a sudden interference and revolution brought about by God. It appears to be God's way to let men work things out for themselves. It is true of the world as of the community that "the redemptive forces are resident forces." While God will help us, he will not do the job for us. In Mark's version of Jesus' teaching about the Kingdom, however, there are suggestions of permanent value. Admission to the Kingdom is based on character and the characteristics required we, too, admire. Devotion to the Kingdom as the supreme value, penitence, unaffectedness, love, were to mark the Kingdom-men. They would be a part of an ideal civilization today also.

The Teaching in Matthew

Summary of Matthew's report.—When we examine Matthew's Gospel we find a much fuller treatment of Jesus' teaching. Mark is more a book of the acts of Jesus than of his teaching, describing seventeen miracles and referring to many

more. While Matthew mentions fourteen of the miracles Mark records, he gives considerably more space than Mark does to the teaching of Jesus. The fifty-one passages in Matthew referring directly to the Kingdom are: 3:2; 4:17, 23; 5:3, 10, 19, 20; 6:10, 33; 7:21; 8:11, 12; 9:35; 10:7; 11:11, 12; 12:28; 13:11, 19, 24, 31, 33, 38, 41, 43, 44, 45, 47, 52; 16:19, 28; 18:1, 3, 4, 23; 19:12, 14, 23, 24; 20:1; 21:31, 43; 22:2; 23:13; 24:14; 25:1, 34; 26:29.

In Matthew, John the Baptist declares that the Kingdom is at hand, and calls for repentance (3:2). When Jesus began to address the crowds his message was the same (4:17, 23). In the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus says the Kingdom-men will be modest (5:3). Endurance for right's sake will also characterize them (5:10). The Kingdom is not to do away with the requirements of the Jewish Law. In fact the Kingdom demands an even higher type of living than the strictest Jews were accustomed to (5:19, 20). Men are to pray for the coming of the Kingdom (6:10), and are to give it first place (6:33). Not everybody gets into the Kingdom, even though he pretend to accept Jesus' leadership. Only those enter who do God's will (7:21). The Kingdom is not limited to the Jews. It will include many non-Jews, while Jews themselves will not get in (8:11, 12). Jesus' message as he goes from village to village is about the Kingdom (9:35). It is

also to be that of the disciples on their tour (10:7). The Kingdom-men will be vastly superior to those that have preceded them, so that an inferior man in the Kingdom will be greater than John the Baptist, whom Jesus eulogizes as the equal of the greatest men of all history (11:11). The verse in 11:12 seems to be a remark added in later times and to refer to the persecutions suffered by the Christians. Jesus argues that his power to exorcise demons is a proof that the Kingdom of God has come, since it shows that the power of Satan has been broken by the Spirit of God which Jesus has (12:28). The disciples have special insight into the facts about the Kingdom which others do not grasp (13:11). Failing to understand what they have heard about the Kingdom they soon forget it (13:19). For a time the Kingdom-people and those who are not the kingdom kind will live in the world together like wheat and darnel (13:24), but will later be separated (13:41), and the Kingdom-people glorified (13:43). The Kingdom will begin in a small way, but gradually increase to huge size (13:31, 33). When a man discovers the Kingdom he values it more than anything else (13:44, 45). At the proper time God will separate the Kingdom-people from the rest of the world as fishermen sort their catch (13:47). Men who understand the Kingdom will find various ways of describing it, some familiar, some original (13:52). Jesus congratulates Peter

upon his recognition of his (Jesus') messiahship, and says that Peter has been given the keys to the Kingdom of Heaven, that is, that Peter understands what the nature of the Kingdom is and can tell men how to get into it (16:19). This verse is a famous one, and often used as a proof that Jesus gave Peter a special power by which he could forgive men their sins or keep them from being forgiven. John 20:23 also states that Jesus gave such a power to the disciples as a group. Did Jesus ever say such things? He did claim to be able to forgive sins (Mark 2:5–11; Matt. 9:2–6; Luke 5:20–24, all the same story). He did teach his disciples to pray that they might be forgiven as much as they had forgiven others (Matt. 6:12), or because they had forgiven others (Luke 11:4). He did say that God's forgiveness was based on men's forgiving their fellows—forgive a man, and God will forgive you; refuse to forgive him, and God will refuse to forgive you (Mark 11:25–26; Matt. 6:14, 15; 18:35; Luke 6:37; 17:3, 4). To so simple and natural a thought about forgiveness as this is it may seem that Jesus would not add the teaching of a mysterious ghostly power, committed to one or all of his disciples. Some will say that it does not sound like Jesus, but like an echo from later Christian thinking. At this distance we can not say that the mind of Jesus could not have held both ideas, that of forgiveness coming spontaneously from God as a result of a man's attitude

toward his fellows, and that of forgiveness as mediated through special agents. The latter method was that with which the Jews were familiar, with their system of priesthood and sacrifices. These words ascribed to Jesus must be taken in connection with all the other teachings ascribed to him, and when compared with these they certainly seem incongruous. Jesus thinks of the Kingdom as coming within the lifetime of some of his hearers (16:28). In the Kingdom the simplicity of childhood is the characteristic most highly valued; without it one can not enter the Kingdom (18:1–4). A forgiving spirit will mark the men of the Kingdom (18:23–35). Some men will abstain from marriage or undergo emasculation to promote the Kingdom (19:12). The Kingdom-men, he repeats, will be simple, sincere, unaffected, like children (19:14). Rich men will have a hard time getting into the Kingdom (19:23, 24). Equality will prevail among the men of the Kingdom (20:1–16). People of the underworld, Jesus says, will respond more quickly to the Kingdom appeal than professional religious leaders (21:31). The Kingdom is not to be limited to the Jews, but to go over to non-Jews (21:43). Rejection of the Kingdom or unfitness for membership cancels a man's chances for a place in it (22:2–14). The Scribes and Pharisees confuse men by their opposition and so keep them out of the Kingdom (23:13). The "good news" of the Kingdom is

mentioned (24:14). The Kingdom is to be consummated suddenly, giving no chance to the unprepared (25:1). The righteous are to receive their reward by being given a part in the Kingdom when Jesus returns in power and glory (25:34). Jesus vows not to taste wine again until he and his disciples drink it in the Kingdom (26:29).

Recapitulation.—Summing up Matthew's fuller statement of Jesus' teaching about the Kingdom, we may say that it was an ideal state of society gradually brought about from a small beginning, but to be completed within the lifetime of some of Jesus' hearers. He thought of it both as already begun and yet to be finished. The end of the period of its growth would be marked by his own return, accompanied by angels, at which time he would assign men of all races to their proper place either in the Kingdom or in a place of suffering. Membership in the Kingdom was to be based on good character as men had demonstrated it in action. The Jews had had an opportunity to accept the Kingdom, but had rejected it, and non-Jews would now have membership in it. Modesty, simplicity, sincerity, such virtues as we regard as natural to childhood would be those that made men fit for the Kingdom. The Kingdom was so important that men should give it the highest place in their lives.

Evaluation.—Thus we can see that even in Matthew, where Jesus' teaching about the King-

dom is given most fully, we can get only a glimpse of what his thought was. There is enough, however, to make it clear that the Kingdom-teaching was the heart of his message, and that he set it before men as life's most commanding ideal. As in Mark, there are features of it which compel our allegiance at once, while there are others that were a part of the thought of the time, and which have no significance now. But the Kingdom as interracial, made up of modest, simple, sincere men, who have exchanged for the religion of organization and ritual, the religion of the Spirit, who are willing to suffer for the right, who are so kindly in their attitude toward others that they are willing to make their own forgiveness of others the yardstick by which God shall measure off the forgiveness they ask for, who have lost their petty, personal cares in enthusiasm for a great, unselfish cause, who back up their professions of loyalty to Jesus by acts of human goodness, these elements appeal today.

THE TEACHING IN LUKE

Summary of Luke's report.—Taking up Luke's report of Jesus' great central message, we find him referring to it directly thirty-seven times, as follows: 4:43; 6:20; 7:28; 8:1, 10; 9:2, 11, 27, 60, 62; 10:9, 11; 11:2, 20; 12:31, 32; 13:18, 20, 28, 29; 14:15; 16:16; 17:20, 21; 18:16, 17, 24, 25, 29; 10:11; 21:31; 22:16, 18, 29, 30; 23:42, 52. As

was the case in Matthew some of these of course are duplicates from Mark.

Luke's first record of Jesus' use of the term, "the Kingdom of God," is in 4:43 in his version of the story told in Mark 1:35–39. Jesus says that he was sent to preach the good tidings of the Kingdom of God. Luke also has the Sermon on the Mount in a shorter form than that of Matthew, chapters 5, 6, 7. According to Luke, Jesus regards poverty as calculated to develop the type of character which distinguishes a Kingdom-man (6:20). Jesus eulogizes John the Baptist as the equal of the greatest men of history, but regards the new civilization he has in mind as so much in advance of the one then present that a Kingdom-man of inferior capacity would be superior to past history's greatest men (7:28). Jesus and his party, composed of at least twenty-five men and women, tour Palestine preaching the Kingdom-doctrine (8:1). In explaining what he meant by his story about the sower and the seed Jesus tells (as in Mark 4:11–12) what his motive was in using stories. His object was not, as is often supposed, to make his meaning clearer, but rather to obscure it, make it harder to understand (8:10). He quotes Isa. 6:9 in his explanation.

Jesus sent twelve of his students out on a village preaching tour (9:2). At Bethsaida, Jesus addresses the crowds that follow him there upon the subject, the Kingdom of God (9:11). Some of his

hearers would live to see the coming of the Kingdom (9:27). The duty of preaching the Kingdom takes precedence even of family obligations (9:60). Once committed to the task of promoting the Kingdom, no retreat was permissible (9:62). He once sent out seventy of his adherents on a preaching tour. Their message was to be, the Kingdom of God was near. If the villages rejected them, they were in leaving to repeat their assertion that the Kingdom was near (10:9, 11). In the Lord's Prayer, Jesus taught men to pray for the coming of the Kingdom (11:2). He regarded his success in casting out demons as a proof that the Kingdom had come (11:20). He thought that if men would devote themselves to the Kingdom, God would see to it that they were supplied with enough to eat and to wear (12:31). God's own interest in the Kingdom was a guaranty of this (12:32). The Kingdom is to grow immensely, though its beginning will be small (13:18, 20). In the Kingdom there will be the old Jewish patriarchs and prophets and many Gentiles. But many of Jesus' hearers may find themselves excluded (13:28–29). In response to the remark of a fellow-guest concerning the felicity of those who should banquet in the Kingdom, Jesus told a story to show how people were refusing the invitation to become sharers in the Kingdom. Those who had the first chance threw it away, and the invitation then went to others who would

appreciate it, that is, to the non-religious classes, the lower strata of Jewish society (14:15–24). In 16:16 Luke clears up the difficult passage in Matt. 11:12 making Jesus comment upon men's eagerness to enter the Kingdom. Upon being asked when the Kingdom would come, Jesus said it was present already (17:20, 21). Obviously he means it has begun. The mustard seed has been planted, the leaven has been placed in the meal. Kingdom-men have the simplicity of childhood (18:16); without such characteristics they cannot enter it (18:17). Rich men enter with the greatest difficulty (18:24, 25). Those who make sacrifices for the Kingdom's sake will be fully recompensed both before and after the Kingdom comes (18:29). "The world to come" or "the age to come" was a common phrase referring to the time after the Kingdom had been set up. In 19:11–27 Luke tells how Jesus threw cold water on the people's idea that the Kingdom was about to be established. Jesus told a story to show that there would be a considerable wait and that meanwhile there was a chance for character to show itself. Incidentally he throws in a threatening warning against those who oppose him. Preceding the coming of the Kingdom there is to be a period of terrific upheaval and distress accompanied by fearful natural calamities (21:31). At the Last Supper, Jesus renounces the partaking in the Passover meal, and drinking

wine, until the Kingdom has come (22:16, 18). He pictures the Kingdom in which his disciples are to share. They are to eat at Jesus' table and each one is to act as a judge of one of the twelve tribes of Israel (22:29–30). One of the men crucified with Jesus asks that Jesus "remember" him—that is with favor—when he shall come in his Kingdom (23:42). Joseph of Arimathea, who secured the body of Jesus after death, was a member of the Kingdom-party among the Jews (23:51). Compare Mark 15:43, and Matt. 27:58, which hints that to be a disciple of Jesus was to be an expecter of the Kingdom.

Recapitulation.—We see, then, that Luke has, to a large extent, the same teaching about the Kingdom which Mark and Matthew preserve, but that he has also some new material. He makes Jesus not only regard wealth as a hindrance to entrance into the Kingdom, but regard poverty as a help. This distinct reference to poverty is a new note. So also the reference (8:1) to the large number of women who accompanied Jesus and his twelve disciples on a preaching tour and who financed the mission is new. Luke also (16:16) makes intelligible a passage which in Matt. 11:12 is difficult to understand. He also identifies the period Jesus speaks of as the "regeneration" in Matt. 19:28 with the Kingdom (22:29, 30). The passage referring to the Father's delight in giving the Kingdom as a

basis for confidence that he will provide food and clothing for the man who devotes himself to the Kingdom (12:32) is new. No other gospel has it. Likewise the whole account of Jesus' statement that the Kingdom is already present among men (17: 20–21) is new material. So also is the bandit's appeal to Jesus to "remember" him in the Kingdom (23:42).

Evaluation.—Aside from the values already noted in the discussion of Mark's and Matthew's reports, Luke's version of Jesus' teaching emphasizes a common observation, viz., the tendency of poverty to strengthen character. This is a point that in the discussion group will at once arouse variant opinions. Obviously the truth does not lie either in extreme affirmation or in extreme denial. Discussion will bring out the lines of limitation. Yet this phase which Luke emphasizes, and which has led some scholars to think that Luke was influenced by the Ebionites, is one which experience in a broad way justifies. A wholesome attitude toward the economic limitations under which most people necessarily live is important, and the recognition of the character-forming value of poverty in the teaching of Jesus is significant. Likewise the prominence given by Luke to the activity of women in connection with Jesus' preaching of the Kingdom-gospel is a feature that will be noted and prized by some. Luke has sometimes been called

the "woman's gospel" because of this emphasis, which may be traced in a number of passages. In these peculiarities, then, Luke's report adds to the values of the Kingdom-teaching.

Recapitulation of Jesus' Teaching about Civilization as Given by Mark, Matthew, and Luke

On the basis of these hundred or more passages in Mark, Matthew, and Luke must rest our reconstruction of Jesus' teaching about the Kingdom. We have nothing else to build upon. We could easily carry the study into the ideas about the Kingdom of God current among the Jews before Jesus and current among the Christians after Jesus, but neither would determine for us with certainty the idea Jesus held. That we must get, if we get it at all, from the gospels, and almost entirely from the first three gospels. The Gospel of John has only three passages, 3:3, 5; 18:36, in which the Kingdom is mentioned, and these are unlike anything in Mark, Matthew, or Luke. What can we say on the basis of the gospel evidence was Jesus' ideal civilization, his conception of the Kingdom of God?

1. It was a society made up of human beings (not angels, archangels, etc.).

2. It was located upon earth (not somewhere in the sky).

3. Jesus himself was to be the ruling person in it.

4. His twelve disciples were to be governors or judges, each heading one of the twelve tribes. Of course at this time there were only two tribes (ten had been "lost" in 721 B.C., see p. 44), but in the Kingdom the ancient number was to be in some way restored.

5. There was to be eating and drinking in the Kingdom and the Twelve were to eat at Jesus' table. Jesus foregoes drinking wine until he may drink it in the Kingdom.

6. The Jewish patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, are to be in the Kingdom, as well as many others, who are non-Jews. Jesus shows elsewhere (Mark 12:26 and parallels) that he thinks of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob as still alive.

7. The Kingdom is to be formally inaugurated by Jesus' own return upon the clouds as the Son of Man, accompanied by hosts of angels.

8. All nations will then be assembled before him in judgment, which will be based upon the treatment they have accorded to the Jews. Any kindness or failure to show kindness to a Jew will be treated by Jesus as if done directly to him personally. The blessing and the doom of this judgment will be for eternity.

9. Preceding the formal inauguration of the Kingdom there will be a period marked by terrific calamities and a state of social anarchy.

10. Jesus anticipates his own death at the hands of the Jewish religious leaders, but believes he will be raised from death and later return as the Son of Man.

11. This return will be within the lifetime of some of his hearers, say roughly inside of fifty years.

12. During this intervening period the Kingdom will gradually grow from a small beginning to immense size. That is, Jesus thinks of it as already numbering a few members, but destined to include multitudes.

13. The Kingdom-men are to be marked by the characteristics of simplicity, modesty, kindliness, the severest rectitude, submission to the will of God, devotion to the Kingdom, poverty, brotherliness.

14. The Kingdom when once established, is to last forever.

Present-day value of the teaching.—What are now the features of Jesus' Kingdom teaching that are of value to us today? Taking it as it stands in the gospels and trying to combine the statements given into a coherent whole, we find much that is foreign to our ways of thinking. But this foreignness lies in the form of expression rather than in the essential idea. As generations pass, terminologies change, but a great idea lives on indefinitely. And Jesus crammed into the phrase the Kingdom of God a meaning that thrills men even yet. Stripped of its temporary trappings it is the Master's dream of

an ideal civilization. It was to be a form of social life in which men lived sincerely, devoutly, simply, with all their actions controlled by love, that is, consideration of the common good. The honoring of the obscure virtues of forbearance, modesty, poverty, unadvertised kindnesses, will mark the Kingdom civilization. Kingdom-men will do the will of God. It has been well said, "The Kingdom of God is a social order wherein men live together as brothers regarding God as Father."

A vision of a possible world-civilization.—Once in a while we catch a glimpse of what human life may become. We see the vision of a humanity united in the task of conquering this planet as a habitation for man. We dream of a time when the immense fortunes that have hitherto been periodically swallowed up in the engulfing crater of war will be spent in the intensification of agriculture, the perfecting of roads, bridges, waterways, sanitation, municipal projects, and all that goes to improve life-conditions. We have been like that French engineer who proposed to open a channel into the Sahara and cover its sands with the waters of the Mediterranean, and so turn a desert into a garden. We have conceived of an era when men should not any more die before their time, when the workman should be adequately protected by safety devices, when scientific sanitation should insure the public health, when proper housing and

nursing should reduce infant mortality, when every human being born into the world should be well born, with its blood free from the taint of transmissible disease, when every life should have a chance to develop to its full value, when the forces of nature should be reduced to servitude, and man conquer so far as may be storm and tidal wave, earthquake and volcano. And more than this, when ignorance, superstition, cruelty, and vice should yield to reason and the religion of Jesus, and men should dwell together in love as the children of the All-Father!

It is only a glimpse we have as yet of what human life may become. We know of the civilizations of Mesopotamia and Egypt seven thousand years ago, but even yet the human race is young. The task of man as given in Genesis, "replenish the earth and subdue it" is only begun. Think how immeasurably life in China will be benefited by the building of railroads and the spread of one common language; think how much of Mexico, South America, Africa, lies uncultivated, untamed wilderness. Think what fascinating fields of research lie open in the values of plants, the discovery of new methods in agriculture, manufacture, machinery, chemistry, medicine, surgery, and every branch of science. Education ought to teach us how to live, but its scheme has been largely remote from life. In education, too, there is a great field for him who would help humanity conquer this planet. Life is

thrillingly interesting when we think of ourselves as partners in the great firm of God, Man, and Company organized for the improvement of the world!

By working all together we can make the Kingdom of God—the ideal world-civilization—come. The part each man has is this—Do Right! When for a day, an hour, we act with those words as our guide, we have for so long, and so far as our influence goes, made the Kingdom of God on earth. In the completed Kingdom every man will do right all the time, then every man will have his chance, earth will be subdued, and human life will have become ideal.

CHAPTER VI

WHAT JESUS TAUGHT ABOUT HATE, WAR, AND NON-RESISTANCE

The problem of hate.—One of the problems raised during the world-war was that of hate. Some asked, "How can we avoid hating the enemy?" Others held that in war time hate is not only unavoidable, but desirable; that men fight best, give most money, and are most patriotic, when they hate hardest, and that consequently, as a war measure, whatever deepens hate is to be promoted. Americans were censured for not hating more intensely, and were advised that the time was coming when they would hate as they had never hated before. Without question many persons honestly believed that to hate the enemy was a virtue and a proof of the soundness of their Americanism. Yet now it is realized that the hate so industriously cultivated must be allowed to die out, or better still, a propaganda of friendliness be launched which shall undo the work done by the propaganda of hate.

Besides this emergency hate of war time there is the social problem of hatred in ordinary life. In many a quiet village and country neighborhood the religious or social worker finds his plans baffled

again and again by the crossing lines of hate. One of the tasks of the minister, for example, is the discovery of the parish hatreds.

Hate is a personal problem, also. Nearly everybody in the course of a lifetime encounters someone who is offensive, or unfair, arrogant, dishonest, or cruel, someone who in some way outrages his feelings and arouses his resentment. He will have to fight hard to keep hate from setting in.

Jesus and the hate problem.—The hate problem in all its phases, international, social, and personal, was familiar to Jesus. Some sixty years before his birth the Roman general Pompey had conquered Palestine and changed it from a little independent state to a tax-ridden province of Rome. The soldiers had cut the throats of the Jews who were worshiping in the Temple. Exorbitant taxation had been followed by Graeco-Roman propaganda and the introduction of pagan customs. Every effort had been made to Romanize Palestine. Against the powerful government that was thus attempting to absorb them and smother their sense of nationality, the Jews cherished an intense hostility. Jesus knew, too, the hatred felt between classes, that between the Jews and the Samaritans, and that between the loyal Jewish citizens and the publicans who had become the agents of Rome. There is a hint, too, that he must have known something of the animosities that existed between rival

villages (John 1:44, 46). And Jesus learned bitterly well from his own experiences what it was to have personal enemies.

Knowing hate so well Jesus stood squarely against it, urging men to love their enemies, and to pray for their persecutors (Matt. 5:43). This is all the more remarkable because in the religion in which Jesus was brought up there was much that sanctioned hate. Jesus mentions as a current quotation from the law, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor and hate thine enemy," not a correct quoting of the law (Lev. 19:18), but one which shows the temper of his fellow-religionists. Moreover, there was much in the Old Testament to justify their attitude. The imprecatory psalms (e.g., Psalms 59 and 69) are samples of terrible curses called forth by religious hate. Of those whom he regarded as the enemies of Yahveh the psalmist says, "I hate them with a perfect hatred" (Ps. 139:22). The prophecy of Nahum is an ancient Jewish "Hymn of Hate." When Jesus teaches love for enemies he is setting up a higher standard of morality than the religion of his ancestors had erected.

We often use the word "hate" without thinking. If one thinks over what hate really is, it is not hard to see why Jesus wished men to eliminate it from their lives. The reason is that hate is an essentially degrading passion. Suspicion, disapproval, hostility, anger, are all at times justifiable and may, if

controlled by reason, even be ennobling. But hate is different, and stands in a class by itself. It is ill-will, desire to injure, and predisposes one to unfair action. Moreover, there is a strain of cowardice in it. It thus reacts on the person who cherishes it, blinding him to facts and making him act against his own interest.

For the negative and degrading passion of hate, Jesus substituted the positive and ennobling attitude of friendliness, of genuine well-wishing, that we call love. Define love as desire for the well-being of others and it is obvious that this attitude is wholly compatible with the sternest justice, in fact demands it. It is no mark of love when parents do not require obedience, when teachers are lax, when officials wink at crime, when national arrogance and oppression are allowed to go unresisted. Jesus made love, consideration for the general good, the controlling principle of action. He recognized also that men tend to react as they are acted upon, that they are likely to take the same attitude toward us that we take toward them. Thus he says (Matt. 7:1–12), "If you are critical, you will be criticised; if you are generous, men will be generous to you; if you want people to treat you in a certain way, treat them in that way, and you will get what you want." Thus Jesus would have us overcome hate in others by showing the kindness in ourselves.

Jesus' teaching about war.—Jesus makes very little direct use of the term "war." The word occurs but four times in his recorded teaching, and then without discussion of the merits of war itself. In Mark 13:7, in the so-called "Little Apocalypse," or "Apocalypse of Jesus," Jesus is represented as saying "And when ye shall hear of wars and rumors of wars, be not troubled." The "Little Apocalypse" is taken up also by Matthew and Luke, and in Matt. 24:6 the saying is rendered, "And ye shall hear of wars and rumors of wars, see that ye be not troubled." In Luke 21:9 the same saying reads, "And when ye shall hear of wars and tumults, be not terrified." In Luke 14:31 in giving warning of the difficulty and cost of discipleship he says, "Or what king, as he goeth to encounter another king in war, will not sit down first and take counsel whether he is able with ten thousand to meet him that cometh against him with twenty thousand?" Jesus then directly mentions war in only two passages, Mark 13:7 and Luke 14:31, since Matt. 24:6 and Luke 21:9 are duplicates of Mark 13:7. In the one instance it occurs in a prediction, in the other in an illustration, but in neither does he discuss war itself.

Indirectly Jesus teaches something, though not much, about war. In Matt. 10:34 he says, "Think not that I came to send peace on the earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword." This is followed

shortly by, "He that findeth his life shall lose it; and he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it." Taking these together it might seem that Jesus thought of heading a revolution, but his general attitude is such as to make it more probable that he had in mind the trying experiences which he foresaw his followers would have to endure. Discipleship was dangerous!

According to Luke 22:35 just before entering Gethsemane, Jesus contrasts the favor the disciples had enjoyed upon their mission tours about the villages of Palestine with the peril of their present situation. The conversation ran like this:

Jesus: When I sent you forth without purse and wallet and shoes, lacked ye anything?

The Disciples: Nothing.

Jesus: But now he that hath a purse, let him take it and likewise a wallet; and he that hath none [that is, no sword] let him sell his cloak and buy a sword.

The Disciples: Lord, behold, here are two swords.

Jesus: It is enough.

Jesus here clearly recognizes that, while his followers were at one time everywhere welcome and their needs supplied by a friendly public, now the situation is different. Powerful enemies are plotting his death. He says he is about to be "reckoned among the transgressors," that is, treated as a criminal. His disciples stand in danger and should prepare for self-defense. Probably he meant only,

"Be on your guard!" If he meant literally that they were to buy swords, it would hardly seem that he would regard two swords as enough for the whole group. And, again, a literal instruction to buy swords for self-defense would not seem to accord with his general teaching of passiveness and trust in the Father.

The classic passage in which Jesus refers to war is Matt. 26:52, "All they that take the sword shall perish with the sword." Even here it is not certain that he intends to declare a universal political principle, viz., that all civilizations that are established by war will ultimately be destroyed by war. It may be that he is thinking of the situation then present, and that he is merely counseling his rash disciple against a foolhardy resistance, merely saying, "If you show fight, they will kill you." The broader meaning, however, would seem not to be out of keeping with Jesus' attitude toward physical violence, and may throw light on the philosophy that lies back of his counsels of non-resistance.

In all the gospels an account is given of some little resistance that was made at the time of Jesus' arrest. The story is told with increasing fulness in the later gospels. In Mark (14:47) a bystander draws a sword and strikes a man who is the servant of the High Priest, cutting off one of his ears. In Matthew (26:51) it is still merely "one of those who were with Jesus" who does this. But Jesus'

remark, already discussed, about taking the sword and perishing by the sword, is added. In Luke (22:49–50) the disciples see that Jesus is about to be arrested and ask him whether they shall strike with their swords. Before Jesus can answer, apparently, one does strike, wounding the high priest's servant as described in Mark and Matthew. But Luke knows that it was the right ear that was cut off, and adds that after mildly reproving the swordsman, Jesus touched the ear of the wounded man and healed him. The Fourth Gospel (18:10) still more definitely says that the sword play was done by Peter, that it was the right ear that was cut off, that the wounded man's name was Malchus, and that he had a relative who was the third of those who questioned Peter when he denied Christ (John 18:26). Jesus orders Peter to put up his sword, accepting his arrest passively as being the will of God.

There remain only the famous "other cheek" passages (Matt. 5:38–42; Luke 6:27–30) and such inferences as may be drawn from Jesus' general attitude toward life as that is depicted in sayings not connected with the topic war.

The "other cheek" passages have always been troublesome. To many it has seemed that they make every form of physical coercion impossible to a Christian; that a Christian may plead, beg, persuade, argue, pray, buy off, propagandize, pro-

test, endure, suffer, educate, but that he may never injure another man's body in his effort at restraint. It has been said that even though a man should see his wife or daughter outraged before his eyes he dare not strike a blow in her defense. He might protest to the man who did the deed, but he must not hurt him. When non-resistance is stated in this extreme way some people are attracted by it. There is a certain appeal about the thought of complete renunciation of all self-assertion and entire submission to what is regarded as God's will. On the other hand, to many such a position seems a cowardly shifting of responsibility. It has been held, however, by men whose courage was beyond question. They were not lacking in physical strength had they chosen to fight, nor were they afraid. They were controlled rather by a religious conviction.[1]

A mediating view.—To many others, however, such a view seems not only mistaken, but unethical. It cannot be right, it is argued, to leave the weak and helpless without a defender. A man is a slacker who permits brutality to go on which he might stop. Jesus, it is pointed out, does not recommend a negligent attitude toward injuries inflicted upon others. He only tells us not to resist insults or injuries to ourselves. He was angry, it

[1] For one of the most famous statements of the non-resistant view see Tolstoï, *My Religion*.

is said, but not at those who harmed him personally. He was angry when he saw others wronged.

Objections to this view.—But even when so stated the doctrine of non-resistance is not wholly satisfying to one's reason, however it may appeal to one's religious feeling. It is obvious that even though one might conceivably be willing to allow one's self to be injured or killed without defending one's self, one's responsibilities to others might not permit one to do so. A father is in duty bound to preserve his life and health as far as lies in his power for his family's sake. To make it clearer, let us think of the president of the United States. His life is carefully guarded. He could not practice non-resistance even as limited to personal injuries. For him to yield his life or his health to the whim of a crank or the hate of an enemy would be an irreparable injustice to the whole American people. In a smaller way each one of us is responsible to some group; we are in duty bound to keep ourselves alive and fit. This is not selfishness, but its opposite. When the good of the group demands that we submit to injury or death or even that we inflict injury and death, that becomes our duty.

Assumptions of non-resistants and the objections urged against them.—Let us take up what seem to be some fundamental assumptions of those who interpret Jesus as a pacifist or who in some other way arrive at the non-resistance conclusion.

First it is assumed that human nature when not opposed by physical violence will react favorably, that is, if the injured man will make no resistance the aggressor will be ashamed and cease his injuries. If you will not resist, your enemy will desist! This claim overlooks the obvious lessons of history and biology. These show that the strong have imposed their will upon the weak even though the weak made no resistance. The principle holds both with men and animals that to make one's self a sheep will not make the wolf cease to be a wolf. The way to safety and respect is not through helplessness.

A second assumption of the non-resistant is that if man will refrain from physical violence, God will interfere in some way in his behalf. God will intervene and prevent the aggressor from fulfilling his design. There are, however, plenty of instances that show that God does not do this. Compare Judg. 18:7–10, 27–29, which tells how the Danites attracted by the wealth and fertility of Laish, a secluded city of quiet, peaceable people, attacked and annihilated it. Defenselessness was no protection against cupidity and power, and God did not interfere to save them. Or read Josephus, *Antiquities* xii. 6, which tells how on one occasion the Jews when attacked by the Syrians made no resistance because it was the Sabbath day. They hid in caves and the Syrians smoked them to death. Though they made no resistance, God did not

deliver them, and a thousand Jews were killed that day.

A third assumption is that of the supreme sacredness of human life. Whatever happens, it is said, we must not take the life of a human being. Here we ought to think clearly about what we mean by "life." In this sense it is the continuation of conscious, animate existence. There are other things, as we have already said, worth more than that. Righteousness, honor, high ideals, and the increase of the significance and nobility of human life in general are worth more. It is still true that it is better for one man to die than for the whole people to perish (John 11:50; 18:14). It is better for many men to die than that the life of whole generations in the future should be degraded.

The truth in the doctrine of non-resistance and summary of objections.—There are two grains of truth in the theory of non-resistance: (*a*) It is commonly recognized that voluntary morality is superior to enforced morality. Non-resistance makes right action optional with the evildoer, not compulsory. (*b*) Non-resistance recognizes that there is a justice in the universe which in the long run punishes wrong action.

To a certain extent, and in minor matters, the spirit of non-resistance has a rightful place. It is the part of magnanimity not to insist that every personal offense be strictly punished. The spirit

of revenge and retaliation reacts harmfully upon the one who cherishes it. There are, however, considerations that make a strict adherence to it in common life impossible.

1. It draws an artificial line between physical and intellectual restraint. If non-resistance is to be practiced rigidly, it would appear that it must not stop at mere abstinence from physical violence. It is not clear why physical restraint should be forbidden and other forms of restraint allowed. If the evildoer may not be restrained by physical force, why may he be by ballot, or statute, or public opinion?

2. If rigidly observed, even as limited to physical violence, it becomes itself a vice. It prevents the protection of those to whom protection is due by those from whom it is due. There can be no effective interference with the selfish and rapacious tendencies of men. In the effort to avoid interference with the wrongdoing of some, responsibility for the welfare of others would be neglected.

3. The assumptions of the non-resistant are flatly opposed to fact. Passivity does not guarantee freedom from attack, either because it will touch the heart of the invader or because God will interfere to protect the man or the nation that refuses to strike. God commits to us the task of making the world what it ought to be. His will will never be done unless we see to it that it is done.

Might does not make right, but right must be backed by might or right will not prevail. The resort to physical force is the last resort, but there must always be a physical force to resort to if necessity arise. Back of all our easy-going, kindly life there are hard, grim facts that only the initiated know. One of our presidents has said, "The foundation of law and order is the judge and the policeman." This is not an argument for brutality, for inhuman methods of punishment for criminals, or for aggressive war. It is the acceptance of the facts of experience. In the Kingdom of God there will be no need for force, but if the friends of the Kingdom never use force, there will never be any Kingdom of God!

Summary and evaluation of the teaching.—The amount of teaching on these topics reported by the Synoptic Gospels is not large, but full enough to give us an idea of what Jesus stood for. He urged the displacement of hate by kindly feeling, he gave no specific teaching about war, though his general attitude would seem to have been such as to have made him opposed to it, and he believed in non-resistance.

The value of the teaching of Jesus regarding hate, war, and non-resistance lies in its substitution of positive and constructive attitudes for negative and destructive ones. Love is better than hate, peace is better than war, and non-resistance is bet-

ter than aggression. Yet, while fully accepting these as ideal standards, we must admit that the passive, non-resistant attitude is not altogether practicable, either in individual or in social life. That is to say, it represents a principle rather than a rule. We need to avoid overstatements both as respects non-resistance (which would lead us into extreme pacifism), and as respects individual and national assertiveness (which would lead us into the philosophy of Nietzsche). Confronted as we are in modern society with complex situations, with relationships to other nations, with perverse, and often perverted and criminal persons and policies to deal with, a supine surrender to things as they are, or to the desires of unsocial individuals and groups would be immoral. The use of force is often necessary, and the very existence of a state or government of any kind presupposes the possibility of its exercise. Thus the extreme non-resistant becomes an amiable anarchist, since if his views were carried into practice none of the present forms of government could continue.

On the other hand we must avoid the ultra-conservative attitude that assumes that "whatever is, is right." We are not committed to the preservation and perpetuation of the customs and the institutions into which we were born merely because they were here when we arrived. They have a right to continue to exist only by virtue of their

ter than [illegible] and the
these as [illegible] on the
passive [illegible] Out of it
practicable [illegible] that the
That is to say [illegible] or that we
a rule. [illegible] to commit
respects [illegible] differ with
extreme [illegible] istian. Thus
national [illegible] and responsi-
the [illegible]
are in [illegible] Believe in Demons?"
relationship [illegible] unt of an experiment
often [illegible] oup of eighty-six men,
to deal with [illegible] m this question was put:
are [illegible] was a pacifist, what would
[illegible] ubstance, "I'd be a pacifist,
groups [illegible] ly, and twenty-nine declared
necessary [illegible] war.
[illegible]
of [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

serviceability and must yield when better forms and methods are discovered. If prisons can be humanized, if unhygienic popular customs can be eliminated, if industrial conditions can be ameliorated, if racial animosities can be turned into friendliness, if war can be done away with, if governments can be improved, by all means let us support such changes. To be merely a "stand-patter," stoutly defending the *status quo* would constitute one an undesirable citizen.

The adoption of a middle course between extreme pacifism and ultra-conservatism naturally fails to satisfy the representatives of either of these extremes. Therefore, the discussion of this topic of hate, war, and non-resistance is likely to arouse lively interest. Probably a few will take the non-resistant attitude, but most rebel against it and present arguments against it. It will be remarked that Jesus did not practice non-resistance when he drove the traders from the Temple. Some will meet this by supposing that he used the "whip of small cords" only on the animals, which will again not satisfy the objectors, who will say that the animals were innocent of any wrong. Others again may suppose that Jesus did not use the whip at all on either animals or men. What then was its purpose? To serve merely as a symbol of force and authority? But why would Jesus employ such a symbol if he did not believe in the use of force?

This topic is one of the most searching and the most fruitful because it compels thinking on the normative value of the ideas of Jesus.[1] Out of it is likely slowly to emerge the perception that the mere fact that Jesus held a certain view, or that we believe he did, is not in itself sufficient to commit us to the same view; that one may differ with Jesus on some points and still be a Christian. Thus it helps to make clearer to us our task and responsibility to think and to build.

[1] See the author's article, "Did Jesus Believe in Demons?" *Biblical World*, July, 1920, p. 376, for account of an experiment conducted during the war with a group of eighty-six men, Christian laymen and ministers, to whom this question was put: "If you became convinced that Jesus was a pacifist, what would you do?" Forty-four replied in substance, "I'd be a pacifist, too." Thirteen answered ambiguously, and twenty-nine declared they would go on supporting the war.

CHAPTER VII

WHAT JESUS TAUGHT ABOUT DEMOCRACY

Jesus and democracy.—Conceivably Jesus might have given a plan for democratic government. There had been examples of government by the people before his time. The Greeks in Athens had centuries before worked out a democracy. The Roman Republic had given way to the Empire only a generation before Jesus' birth. But Jesus, like the race from which he sprang, had religion, not politics, for his life-passion. In describing those who should enter the Kingdom, and in directing the activities of his disciples in the period that would intervene before the setting up of the Kingdom, Jesus emphasized moral and divine, rather than political, forces. As the gospels represent him, the ideal civilization of which he taught was to be realized not through a long, slow process of gradual improvement in social conditions, wrought out by study and experiment, but by a divine interference in human affairs through which Jesus would become the supreme ruler over a world of men of the Kingdom type, and all offending elements would be eliminated.

It is obvious then that we are not to expect an elaborate outline of democracy in Jesus' teaching.

What we may fairly do is to raise the question whether in Jesus' words anywhere we find expressed principles which anticipate those embodied in the modern conception of democracy. We need then, first to clarify our minds as to the outstanding ideas represented in democratic government.

Fundamental Conceptions of Democracy

Lincoln's phrase "government of the people, by the people, for the people" has become a classic. So, too, has that of the Declaration of Independence, "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." The Great War drew the line sharply between autocracy and democracy. Both terms are derived from the Greek. From *autos*, "self," and *kratos*, "strength," we have "autocratic," "having strength or power in one's self," which is used of a ruler who has unlimited power in himself and is responsible to no one but himself. From *demos*, "people," and *kratos*, "strength," we have "democratic," which is used of a government in which the power is located in the people. We may say that autocracy is government by Himself, democracy is government by Ourselves. It is the difference between He and We. Of democracy in this governmental sense Jesus has nothing to say. But in respect to some of the principles and results of democracy Jesus gives some of his finest teachings.

1. **Consideration of community good.**—It is one of the commonest of sayings now that we ought to live for others. While we may not be pharisaical enough to assert that selfishness has died within us, we do constantly affirm that consideration of community good ought to be the controlling principle of individual living. In the same way we assert that in state affairs thought must be taken for world-betterment and not merely for national aggrandizement. If there were communication and relationship between earth and other worlds, we should doubtless be required to think, not only of what seemed for the good of our planet, but of how the inhabitants of other worlds would be affected by our action. Democracy thus recognizes the complex network of social relationships, and would have consideration for social good be the supreme law. Whence have we learned this altruistic insistence? Partly, at least, from the teaching of Jesus. Consider Mark 10:42–45, and Jesus' teaching that the governing principle of his own life was consideration for others, and that this was to take the place of personal ambition among his followers. The way Jesus reacted in the presence of large bodies of men is an indication of the same spirit (Mark 6:34; Matt. 9:36; 14:14). A great crowd is an appealing sight, but the appeal it makes depends upon the kind of man who is looking at it. It may present itself to him as something to be swayed to laughter

and tears, and manipulated to his own glorification or the success of his cause. He may easily think of it as a business opportunity. To the parasitic classes of society, the vicious and the criminal, the assembling of large numbers of people is always a signal for mobilization. Look out for pickpockets on circus day! When Jesus saw a crowd, however, he seems to have felt a surge of friendliness and desire to help. This merging of one's own interests in the interest of the community is essential to democracy.

Upon consideration, however, it becomes obvious that the principle that all action should be controlled by consideration of its effect upon others is not a universal solvent for life's problems. For, first, experience shows us that we cannot forecast infallibly how others will be affected by our action. And secondly, we are unable for any great length of time to ignore ourselves and act without self-interest. We rise to heroic moments of self-forgetfulness; we may even habituate ourselves to a plan of action which is at first distasteful to us out of consideration for others, but we are by nature so constituted that we can no more absolutely banish self-consideration than we can stop breathing. Even when we undertake the most unselfish or non-remunerative tasks, become settlement workers, or foreign missionaries, or nurses, we can never be quite sure that the deciding consideration was not

after all one of self-interest, that we should be happiest in doing these things, and unhappy in refusing to do them. Thinking of this saves us from the self-congratulatory and holier-than-thou attitude that is a snare to those who go into work which they regard as entailing personal sacrifice.

2. The value of the individual.—These considerations lead us to another great principle of democracy, which is likewise one of the teachings of Jesus, viz., the right and importance of the individual. This is a corollary, not a contradiction of the preceding. If you are to control your action by consideration for its effect upon another or others, the reason for it is their significance as persons. But you are a person, too, and therefore of significance also. A healthy recognition of one's own significance is necessary if one is to be of much usefulness to others. A man must know that he is good for something if he is going to be good for much. Democracy recognizes the significance of the units of society. It stands for the full realization of life for every man through the development of all his latent capacities. It believes in the raising of the general tone of society through the improvement of the life of each individual as well as the converse. Jesus, too, put this emphasis upon the value of the individual. Nothing is more precious to a man than the possibility of self-realization (Mark 8:36; Matt. 16:26). The Sabbath exists for human wel-

fare (Mark 2:27; cf. also Matt. 12:11–12). Each member of the Kingdom is sacred, and acts of kindness to them will be rewarded (Matt. 10:42), while injuries offered them will be fearfully punished (Mark 9:42; Matt. 18:6–10; Luke 17:1–2). In one of his most famous sayings he calls men to discipleship, offering individual freedom, peace, inner harmony (Matt. 11:28–30). The stories of healings, too, with which the gospels abound indicate Jesus' interest in removing men's handicaps and giving them a better chance.

3. **Equal opportunity.**—This last leads us to another fundamental doctrine of democracy, viz., that of equality of opportunity. No scheme of government could be devised which would turn out citizens of precisely the same grade, as a watch factory may make its product of uniform quality. Too many and too uncertain factors enter into the making of human character to allow that. Moreover, individuality itself necessitates native inequality. Nevertheless, we do know that men are products just as everything else is, and that if subjected to given influences men will turn out in the large in a similar way. Thus climate, occupations, and the topography of a country shape the character of its inhabitants. So, too, do its government and institutions. A whole generation of young minds may be molded just as the mind of one child may be. Thus while it is not possible or desirable

to turn out citizens of a uniform type, a certain standard of attainment may be reached. This is made possible by the guaranty of equality of opportunity.

When we speak of equality of opportunity in a democracy, we mean that every person shall have access to the agencies that tend to develop to the fullest extent his native capacities. Thus it means that education to an advanced stage shall be made free and compulsory; that there shall be elasticity in the class divisions of society so that persons may move about from class to class as their ability may dictate. Thus democracy means negatively the removal of handicaps, and positively the promotion of contact with developmental influences. In two phases of Jesus' teaching similar tendencies may be seen: first, in his condemnation of the enslavement of men by insistence upon trivialities of form, and his emphasis upon fundamentals (Mark 2:27; Matt. 15:1–20; 23:23; Luke 11:42). Thus Jesus, by the removal of handicaps, anticipated one of the great factors of democratic equality of opportunity. The other, promotion of contact with developmental agencies, he taught by his own example of free association with men of various classes. In his own personality he possessed what we see now to have been one of the most significant developmental agencies the world has known. Like Socrates, he gave himself freely to all so that any man who

would might have a chance to share his inspiring, liberating message and feel the influence of his personal power. In doing this he frequently stepped beyond the bounds of what was in those days considered propriety (Mark 2:15–16; Matt. 9:10, 11; Luke 5:29–30; 7:34; 19:7).

4. **Kindly interest in foreigners.**—Democracy is marked also by its attitude of welcome and appreciation toward foreigners; not toward tourists and distinguished visitors only, but toward the immigrant and his children. His different birthplace, language, and customs do not make him unwelcome or despised. He is taken into the great democratic family, his children share with the native-born the advantages of education, and both he and they are free to rise as high in the world as their natural abilities will take them. America is up to date the most striking example of this free intermingling of nationalities. It is not likely, however, to be the last one, though its undeveloped natural resources may for a good while continue to make it the most attractive goal for emigration. But that freedom of movement from one continent to another which modern transportation and social conditions stimulate, and which has been so marked within recent years, we may expect to see continually augmented.

During the world-war thousands and millions of men crossed the ocean who would never have done

so under normal conditions. They learned the ways and languages of foreign countries and caught an understanding of their ideals. All this tends to break down provincialism, chauvinism, and nationalistic prejudices and create world-consciousness. All of us are thinking internationally now in a way we never did before. This international interest was implicit in democracy always, but the conditions of the world at present bring it to conscious and constant expression.

We have already noticed that on this point the gospels represent different emphases. Mark and Matthew ascribe to Jesus a nationalistic feeling that is softened by Luke, though all three record near the end instructions for universal evangelization (Mark 16:15; Matt. 28:19; Luke 24:47). According to Luke, then, Jesus had a distinctly friendly attitude toward non-Jews and more than once took occasion to compare Jew and Gentile in a way unfavorable to the Jew (Luke 4:25–27; 10:31–36; 17:17–18; 7:9; but cf. Matt. 8:10). In so far then as Jesus surmounted national prejudices and felt an affection for and desire to serve men of other nationalities than his own, he exemplified another of the leading principles of democracy, i.e., international and interracial friendliness, the welcoming of the foreign-born to the same range of advantage and opportunity we create for ourselves and our children.

We have examined the Synoptic Gospels once more to see what in the teaching of Jesus corresponded to the ideas common now to democratic thinking. Taking the four topics, consideration of community good as a deciding factor in conduct, the importance and significance of the individual, equality of opportunity, and friendly attitude toward foreigners, we find hints in the teaching of Jesus which indicate that he held to these fundamental principles of democracy, and which justify us in calling him the world's Great Democrat.

CHAPTER VIII

WHAT JESUS TAUGHT ABOUT RELIGION

Religion in Palestine.—In Palestine religion seems always to have been the topic of supreme interest. The wars the Jews fought there were mainly religious wars. The greatness of Israel's great men nearly always was in some way connected with their religion. Yet we must remember that Israel did not have a monopoly of religion; all the surrounding nations had their religions, too. We should be able to infer this, even if we had no direct evidence, for historians and anthropologists find that religion of some sort exists in every society. It has been said that mankind is "incurably religious." Men seem always to be groping for God. Their inherent religious impulse expresses itself in crude or cultured ways according to the stage of their civilization and in keeping with their national character. We have, however, some few remains of these ancient neighboring religions and considerable reference to them in the Bible. These references show that the Jews regarded them as base and degrading. Doubtless they contained some noble elements, however. It may be asked why these religions died, while Judaism lived on. They have wholly disappeared, as have the people

who held them. Yet the Jews and the Jewish religion survive. Why?

Jesus a great teacher of religion.—Jesus is accepted by Christians generally as the world's greatest teacher of religion. This conviction may exist, however, without its being based upon a thorough study of his religious teaching. Jesus began a movement which at the present time modifies the religious thought of every third person on earth. What explains the extraordinary impulse he gave? Did he teach something that will fire us with enthusiasm as it fired people twenty centuries ago? Can we present an appeal today that will grip as his appeal gripped? Much of what Jesus says about religion is in connection with his teaching about the Kingdom, already studied. He never uses the term religion itself. It occurs rarely in the Bible, anyway; in the Greek in Acts 26:5; Col. 2:18; Jas. 1:26, 27, only; cf. also Gal. 1:13, 14 in the English translation.

THE TEACHING IN MARK

Summary of Mark's report.—Taking up Jesus' teaching concerning religion as it is presented in Mark we find that Jesus demands repentance and acceptance of his views of the near approach of the Kingdom (1:14). Repentance we may define as regret, resulting in revised behavior. The demand for national repentance was in keeping with the

current conviction that if Israel would for one day do Jehovah's will the Messiah would come. Calling Peter and Andrew to discipleship, Jesus says they shall become "fishers of men," that is, men who will present the Kingdom appeal to other men (1:17). Jesus defends his association with non-respectable people by the remark that they were the sort who needed him (2:15–17). Being questioned as to his disciple's disregard of the customary days of fasting, he says that it would not be appropriate to their present joyous feelings, thus setting up the principle of sincerity, viz., that one's religious ceremonies should correspond to one's actual feeling (2:18–22). He justified what the scrupulous Pharisees regarded as Sabbath desecration by the far-reaching principle of consideration for human good (2:23–27; 3:1–6). For so profoundly sensible and humanitarian a view as this ecclesiastics plotted his death! (3:6.) He regards those who do God's will, i.e., the Kingdom-people, as more closely related to him than those of his own flesh and blood (3:31–35). In reply to the criticism that some of his disciples were eating without the customary religious ceremony of washing their hands, he denounces those who are clever at evading natural duties under the pretense of being devoted to religion, and enunciates the principle that real degradation is spiritual, being promoted, not by neglect of some trivial ceremony, but by the

cherishing of impure and vicious thoughts (7:5–23). Jesus predicts his own suffering, rejection, death, and resurrection, and challenges his followers to follow him in giving up their lives (8:31–38). At Capernaum, Jesus is led by a dispute between the disciples to rebuke their egotism by the remark that the self-seeker would get the lowest place (9:33–35). This is the obverse of his emphasis upon humility as a path to promotion, which is elsewhere given in both its phases (Luke 14:11; 18:14). In answer to a question about divorce Jesus traces marriage to the original creation of human beings, basing his argument upon the use of the words "male and female" in Gen. 1:27, his conclusion being that since at the beginning God created a human pair, it was adulterous for married couples to separate and marry members of other couples. The permission to do this granted by the Mosaic Law he regards as a concession to the stubborn and intractable dispositions of men (10:2–12). Jesus evidently thought of monogamy as the original form of marriage. Questioned by a wealthy man as to the way to secure eternal life, Jesus mentions six of the Ten Commandments. Upon learning that the man had kept these Jesus suggests that he give away his wealth and become one of his disciples. The man is unable or unwilling to do this and goes sadly away. Jesus remarks upon the difficulty rich men have in entering the Kingdom and asserts that

all who make any sacrifice for the Kingdom's sake will be fully repaid even before the Kingdom is established, while after it is established they will share in its eternal blessedness (10:23–31). In regard to those who are eager for prominence and leadership Jesus again says that among his disciples such ambition is to be curbed by giving the self-seeker the most menial sort of service. His own purpose, he said, was not to dominate men, but to serve them, and to die for their sakes. He regarded his death as an inevitable part of the Kingdom program. Without it the Kingdom would not come, and the Kingdom-people would not be rescued from the then present age to the age of blessedness to be introduced when the Kingdom was completely established (10:35–36). Jesus regards undoubting confidence in prayer as a guaranty that the thing prayed for will occur (11:23–24). God's forgiveness of a man's sins is conditioned upon that man's forgiveness of those who have wronged him (11:24–25). Going into the Temple, Jesus violently interferes with the business being carried on there, and denounces it as a misuse of a place intended for worship (11:15–18). Questioned as to his right to do this, he astutely confounds his critics and refuses to answer (11:27–33). When enemies try to induce him to show disloyalty to the Roman emperor he evades the negative answer they were expecting from him, and replies in a fashion that leaves no

handle for criticism by demanding the fulfilment of both political and religious duty (12:13–17). He thus refuses to commit himself as to what course should be followed in this particular case where political and religious duties were thought to conflict, leaving that to their own moral judgment to decide, but implying that both duties were real. He asserts that in the next life human beings will be like angels (sexless?) and marriage unknown. That there is a future life he argues from Exod. 3:6, holding that the statement "I am the God of Abraham and the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob" indicates that these patriarchs who had lived long before were then still alive (12:18–27). The commands to love God and one's neighbor Jesus regards as the most important in the Jewish law (12:28, 34). He denounces the business cruelty and religious ostentation of the Scribes (12:38–40), while he praises a widow who gave out of her poverty to the Temple offering (12:41–44). The disciples may expect to be arrested, beaten, and put on trial, hated by members of their own family, but are to be steadfast and without anxiety, trusting the Holy Spirit to give them the words they shall use in their defense (13:9–13). At the Last Supper Jesus again alludes to his death and its connection with the Kingdom program (14:24). The closing scenes of Mark's Gospel relate action rather than record teaching. They show though, how to the last

Jesus lived true to his religion. The scene in Gethsemane shows how he followed out his own emphasis upon doing the will of God (14:32–42). He readily submits to arrest because he regards it as a part of the foreordained program of his life (14:43–49). He asserts his messiahship before the Jewish Council (14:61–62). At the end his sense of God's support, which doubtless had been the secret of the strength of his life, temporarily failed him (15:34). After the resurrection he sends out his followers to Christianize the world (16:15).

Recapitulation.—In summarizing what Jesus taught about religion as it is preserved in Mark we may say that he is never represented as discussing religion formally and never uses that term, that much of what he thought and taught about religion must be gathered from his actions, and that his teaching about religion was an integral part of his teaching about the Kingdom. Religion, to Jesus, meant repentance, belief in his Kingdom message, attempt to interest others in the Kingdom, association with irreligious and non-respectable people for the sake of helping them, sincerity in religious ceremonial, consideration for human good rather than meticulous observance of legal rules as the controlling principle of behavior, the sharing in the doing of God's will as constituting a closer bond than that of kinship, inward, spiritual rightness as contrasted

with religious pretense, his own death as an inevitable event in the establishment of the Kingdom, and that of the disciples as a probable one, suppression of selfish ambition, preservation of the marriage tie, keeping of the Ten Commandments, sacrifice for the Kingdom's sake, prayer with undoubting confidence, forgiveness of others as the basis of one's own forgiveness, reverence for sacred places, fulfilment of both civil and religious duties, a belief in the future life, whole-hearted love to God and one's neighbor, self-denying giving, steadfastness and freedom from anxiety in danger.

THE TEACHING IN MATTHEW

Summary of Matthew's report.—The first sentence Matthew ascribes to Jesus (3:15), though not perhaps a distinctly religious teaching, has to do with a religious ceremony. John the Baptist recognizes Jesus' superiority before the baptism (for another view, cf. John 1:33) and is reluctant to baptize him. Jesus admits the force of John's objection but argues that submission to baptism on his part is exemplary, though unnecessary. This passage has been thought to be an early Christian attempt to meet the difficulty of explaining why Jesus was baptized, showing that in his case it had no reference to the forgiveness of sins, but that it was a superfluous act of righteousness done by Jesus as an example to others.

Matthew's account of the temptation is much fuller than Mark's and in it we find the first religious teaching ascribed to Jesus in this Gospel (4:1–10). In the first temptation he quotes Deut. 8:3 as an argument that it is not essential that one have bread to eat. Other things may do as well if God chooses to substitute them, as he did in providing the manna for the Israelites (4:4). This is Jesus' familiar doctrine of submission to and trust in the Father. Bread is not essential. Man's attitude should not be one of demand for anything, but of acquiescence in what the Father provides.

In the second temptation Jesus quotes Deut. 6:16 against the suggestion that he leap down from the Temple. With Deut. 6:16 cf. Exod. 17:2, 7, which explains what was there meant by "tempting" Jehovah, viz., trying his patience, exasperating him by complaint. As used here the term "tempt" would seem to mean experiment with, subject to an unnecessary test. This Jesus is resolved to avoid.

In the third temptation Jesus quotes Deut. 6:13, inserting the word "only" and making the point of the passage to be that ancient Scripture commanded worship to be limited to Jehovah alone.

The religious teaching with which Jesus began his ministry according to both Mark and Matthew was the call to repentance in view of the near approach of the Kingdom (cf. Mark 1:14). His

teaching in general on his tours about Galilee had to do with the Kingdom (4:23). In the Sermon on the Mount (chaps. 5–7) we have the longest and fullest religious discourse ascribed to Jesus in any of the Synoptic Gospels. Our previous study of what Jesus taught about civilization helps us to understand it. It begins with a series of congratulations to those classes of people who are to become members of the Kingdom. These are the humble, the troubled, the self-effacing, the spiritually dissatisfied, the lenient, the clean-minded, the mediating, and those who endure misunderstanding and intolerant treatment because of their adherence to Jesus (5:3–12). They cannot help being conspicuous, and are to make sure that their influence is wholesome (5:13–16). Jesus denies that he is an iconoclast as respects the Jewish law. He fully believes in its perpetual validity and his followers will be rated according to the respect they show for it. They must be even more punctilious than the Scribes and Pharisees if they are to enter the Kingdom (5:17–20). To illustrate this principle he applies it to several concrete examples, viz., murder, adultery, perjury, revenge, nationalism, in each case extending the Mosaic statute. Thus he condemns not only murder, but anger and contemptuous and insulting epithets which lead to murder. So important is it to prevent the growth of ill-feeling that one must even break off from a religious cere-

mony to set one's self right with a man whose feelings one has offended. Every effort is to be made to speed up the rebuilding of friendly relations (5: 21–26). Notice what stress Jesus lays on the faculty of getting along with people. As to adultery, again Jesus condemns not only the act itself, but the cherishing of lustful thoughts that lead to the act (cf. also 15:11, 18–20; Mark 7:20–23). Whatever induces these is to be avoided, even at severe sacrifice. It is not impossible that Jesus here intends to recommend submission to castration from ascetic motives. Compare on this point Matt. 19:11–12. Divorce is not permissible except upon the ground of the wife's unchastity, and to marry a woman who has been divorced is sinful. Compare also Matt. 19:9, where the addition is made that remarriage is forbidden to the husband who has divorced his wife unless he divorced her upon the ground of unchastity. Note that in the earlier Gospel Mark (10:11) no exception is made, and remarriage after divorce is forbidden to both the divorced parties. Luke 16:18 gives Jesus' statement in the same form as Mark. It is thought the words "except for fornication" are an insertion made by Matthew and that the severer statements of Mark and Luke correctly represent Jesus' view. Note that in any case here as in the other instances Jesus' teaching is an advance upon the Mosaic requirements. Deuteronomy 24:1–4 had permitted

the husband to divorce his wife in case she proved unsatisfactory, and also permitted her to marry a second time, only forbidding her to go back to her first husband in case her second husband should die or divorce her. Jesus holds that the remarriage of a divorced woman is illegitimate. Elsewhere (p. 131) we have noted what argument Jesus offered in support of his conviction of the indissolubility of marriage. In respect to perjury Jesus points out that it is futile to use oaths because the things sworn by are outside of the control of the man using the oath. Heaven, earth, Jersualem, even the color of a single hair of his own head, lie outside the sphere of his control. Men should therefore abstain from oaths altogether, simple "yes" and "no" being strong enough (5:33–37). It is to be noted that the reference is not to cursing or profane language, but to the use of some phrase supposed to guarantee the truth of what one says, like our "so help me, God." Once more Jesus extends the Mosaic Law, and instead of saying that men must not fail to tell the truth when they have sworn to do so, rules that men must tell the truth all the time. Compare also Jas. 5:12. As to the Mosaic law limiting retaliation to an equivalent of that which one had suffered, Jesus would eliminate retaliation altogether, and have men return only good to those who have injured them, and yield without resistance to those who choose to impose upon them

(5:33–42. See fuller note on p. 108). In regard to racial distinctions Jesus taught that his followers' good will was not to be limited to their fellow-Jews, but to extend to foreigners and anti-Semites. In the breadth of their good will they were to be like the heavenly Father who paid no attention to nationality in his bestowing of sunlight and rain. To limit their friendliness to those of their own circle would be to adopt a standard no higher than that of tax-collectors and foreigners, who were commonly most despised (5:43–48). Thus by all these illustrations Jesus supports his assertion that his teaching does not lower but raises the standards of the earlier religious teaching revered by the Jews. He insists upon an extension, not an abrogation, of Mosaic morality. It may help us to fix this in mind by reflecting that the sign of the cross is the plus sign, too.

Turning now to another topic, he shows what must be the controlling motive for his followers as they express their religion by the ordinary methods of charity, prayer, and fasting. All these are to be performed not with ostentatious publicity to impress other men and win their applause, but secretly and to gain the inner sense of God's approval (6:1–16). The same consideration will apply to their acquirement of property.

The Kingdom and their place in the Kingdom is to become life's controlling motive. The acquisi-

tion of property and the anxiety for the future that prompts it are both to be avoided. Since God provides for the needs of birds and wild flowers, he may safely be trusted to provide for the needs of those who occupy themselves wholly with the promotion of the Kingdom (6:19–34). The rest of the sermon (7:1–27) is given to a number of apparently unrelated topics ending with a final appeal to his hearers to accept his teaching and build their conduct for the future upon it in order that when the catastrophes that form a part of the messianic program come, they may survive. Of these unrelated topics there are seven: (1) God's judgment will be based upon men's judgment of each other. It is the part of wisdom then to study one's own faults rather than those of others (7:1–5). (2) The Kingdom-people are not to waste their teaching upon the unsusceptible (7:6). (3) Men grant the requests of their fellows; it is the more certain that God will answer prayer (7:7–11). (4) The rule of one's treatment of others is to be the thought of how one would one's self like to be treated in the circumstances (7:12). (5) Admission to the Kingdom involves difficulty and limitation, and few will succeed in entering it (7:13–14). (6) His followers are to be on their guard against impostors. At the messianic judgment Jesus will himself expose them and pronounce their doom (7:15–23). (7) Those who give heed to Jesus' teachings and act upon

them will survive the calamities of this coming judgment, those who do not will be destroyed (7: 24–27).

In Matt. 9:12 as elsewhere in the gospels (e.g., Matt. 11:19; Luke 15:2) Jesus is criticized for his association with disreputable classes. But in Matthew (9:13) he adds to his defense a quotation of Hos. 6:6, one of the high peaks of Hebrew religion as represented by the Prophets. The same passage is assigned to him in another connection in Matt. 12:7. Such a verse would be well in keeping with Jesus' disregard for the formalities of religion and his insistence upon its realities. Jesus feels that the people generally are ready to accept the Kingdom message, but that there are few to proclaim it, and urges the disciples to pray God to increase their number (9:37, 38). The whole of the tenth chapter of Matthew is devoted to the instructions given the Twelve before they are sent out upon a mission tour. They were to avoid all except Jews. They were to announce that the Kingdom was near and perform miracles. They were to depend on the populace for food. Should they be turned away from any home or village a curse would fall upon that place at the messianic judgment. They could expect arrest and scourging, and trial before important rulers, but were to make no preparation beforehand for defense. Their teaching would provoke murder. They would be detested and persecuted.

Before they had completed the round of the Jewish cities, the messianic judgment would have come. They could expect to be treated as Jesus himself had been treated, but were not to fear even death. God would take note of their sufferings and at the messianic judgment Jesus would publicly acknowledge them as his followers, while those who had refused allegiance to him, he would disown. So far from being a peace-bringer he declares himself a social firebrand and demands from his followers devotion to the bitter death. The slightest kindnesses shown them by others will be fitly rewarded (10:1–42).

In answer to a charge that his disciples broke the Sabbath, Jesus argues that whatever is helpful to men is legitimate on that day (12:1–14). In criticism of the people of his time he uses as an illustration the case of a demon which has been exorcised, but which returns to its victim bringing seven worse demons with it so that the man is worse off than before, the point being that a future worse than the present was ahead of his listeners (12:43–45). Incidentally, however, this passage gives an example of Jesus' ideas in regard to demoniacal possession as represented in the gospels. Other of Jesus' religious teachings are the foredoom of institutions not founded by God (15:13; cf. also Acts 5:34–35, 38, 39); the power of faith to produce changes in nature (17:20); importance of avoiding

any injury to his followers, who have angels to represent their case before God and whom God cares for as a shepherd cares for his sheep (18:5–14). He outlines a plan for the settlement of personal difficulties among his followers (18:15–18). The concerted prayer of two of his disciples is certain to be answered (18:19). God's forgiveness of men is contingent upon their forgiveness of others (18:21–35). In the Kingdom there is to be a complete reversal of ordinary standards (20:1–16). While in gentile society honor is paid those who have power to dominate others, among the disciples honor is to be won by service (20:25–27). Jesus holds that the sanctity of the Temple should be preserved (21:12–13). He thinks of the life after death as a condition where marriage will no longer obtain (22:23–30). He uses Exod. 3:6 as a proof of the continuance of life after death (22:31–33). In reply to a question put by a Pharisee, Jesus sums up the whole of Jewish religious teaching in love to God and one's neighbor (22:34–40).

Almost the whole of chapter 23 is devoted to a denunciation of the Scribes and Pharisees, the main charges against them being their failure to do themselves that which they required others to do, their ostentation and vanity (vss. 1–12), their hostility to the Kingdom-teaching (vs. 13), their mistaken zeal in proselyting (vs. 15), their hair-splitting distinctions (vss. 16–22), their neglect of

great matters in their insistence upon small ones (vss. 23–24), their hypocrisy (vss. 27–28), their resistance to the religious leaders God had sent (vss. 29–36).

The twenty-fourth chapter is similar to Mark, chapter 13, and Luke, chapter 24, and describes the catastrophes that will precede the coming of the Son of Man. These will be the destruction of the Temple, a general reign of terror marked by wars, famines, earthquakes, the rise of false leaders, hatred, betrayal, delusion, and apostasy. Before the end comes the gospel of the Kingdom is to be preached to all nations. Then there will be portents in the sky, and the Son of Man will appear in the clouds with his angels, who will assemble the Kingdom-people from all parts of the earth. All this is to take place during his own generation. His coming as Son of Man will be sudden and unexpected and will bring terrible destruction to the unfaithful.

Further illustrating the suddenness and irrevocability of his coming, and as a warning against neglect of the intervening time of opportunity, Jesus tells the parables of the Ten Virgins and the one-talent man. A vivid picture of the messianic judgment follows (25:31–46) where it appears that the basal consideration is to be the treatment which has been given to the Jews. In the scene in Gethsemane we see Jesus living the doctrine he

frequently taught, that of submission to God's will (26:36–46), and in his arrest and later in the trial we see his own example of non-resistance (26:47–52). He accepts the whole experience as preordained and described in Scripture. He does not need Peter's defense, but were it not God's will for him to be thus humiliated he could call to his assistance not merely twelve men, but more than twelve legions (some 72,000) angels. The last word Matthew ascribes to Jesus before his death is the pathetic and despairing cry, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" (27:46.) After the resurrection he meets the disciples at a mountain in Galilee and gives them the "Great Commission," directing them to continue to preach the Kingdom message until the end of the age (28:16–20).

Recapitulation.—Undertaking now to sum up Matthew's presentation of Jesus' teaching about religion, we find Jesus represented as familiar with the Book of Deuteronomy, and quoting it in crucial moments; as preaching repentance and the near approach of the Kingdom; as depicting the character of the Kingdom-people; as asserting his regard for the Mosaic Law and extending its obligations to the realm of thought and intention; as emphasizing rightness in human relationships, even to the interruption of religious ceremonies, and making this rightness the basis of forgiveness with

God; as urging a good will that ignores racial distinctions; as decrying ostentation in religious habits; as making life's central passion devotion to the Kingdom with consequent freedom from anxiety as to other matters; as expressing faith in prayer based upon the fatherly character of God; as cautioning his followers against misspending energy upon the unteachable; as making the treatment one would desire from others the guide to one's treatment of others; as making religion a thing of the spirit, not of ceremony; as limiting his own and his disciples' ministry to the Jewish people; as warning his disciples of the persecutions they will suffer; as forecasting national calamities for his nation; as believing in the certain failure of institutions which are not of divine origin; as making service the path to leadership; as affirming that the Temple was to be kept sacred to religious uses; as believing in life after death and to some extent describing its conditions; as summing up the whole of Jewish ethical and religious teaching in the formula of love for God and neighbor; as excoriating the Scribes and Pharisees for their ostentation and wrong-headedness; as predicting in vivid apocalyptic phrases the catastrophes which would be the precursors of his return as the Son of Man, and the messianic judgment that would follow it; as warning against misuse of the intervening period and unpreparedness at his return; as accept-

ing the incidents of his arrest and death as preordained and submissively to be undergone.

THE TEACHING IN LUKE

Summary of Luke's report.—Luke preserves an account of one of Jesus' boyhood experiences, and the first words he ascribes to him are those of his reply to his mother's questioning: "How is it that ye sought me? Knew ye not that I must be in my Father's house?" (2:41–51.) This has been taken to indicate that Jesus had not only an extraordinary precocity in religious matters, but an unusual sense of relatedness to God, and it would appear that the story is told with the intention of producing this effect. For a parallel to Jesus' talking with the doctors of the law compare Josephus' *Autobiography*, where he tells how he himself when at the age of about fourteen years used to be consulted by the high priests and leading citizens who would come frequently to him in a body to get his opinion on knotty questions of Jewish law.

In Luke's narrative of the temptation (4:1–12) the order of the temptations is bread, kingdoms, Temple, while in Matthew it is bread, Temple, kingdoms. The same passages of Scripture are quoted as in Matthew, already discussed. Luke has a fuller account of Jesus' preaching at Nazareth (4:16–30) than those given in Mark 6:1–6 and

Matt. 13:54–58, and while in Mark and Matthew the villagers are angered at the unusual gifts shown by a fellow-villager whose humble origin was well known, in Luke their anger arises from his pro-gentile attitude. In regard to the Sabbath, Jesus affirms by both act and teaching that acts of human kindness are legitimate upon that day (6:1–11). Luke's Sermon on the Plain (6:20–49) gives part of the material Matthew preserves in the Sermon on the Mount, with some differences. Thus where Matthew says, "Blessed are the poor in spirit," Luke says, "Blessed are the poor." The thirty-eighth verse is an addition, but on the whole the sermon in Luke is much shorter than in Matthew. Parts of the sermon are scattered through the eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth, and sixteenth chapters of Luke. The Lord's Prayer, e.g., occurs in a different setting (11:1–4) than in Matt. 6:9–13. Luke has some sayings of Jesus which neither Mark nor Matthew presents, e.g., the fine sentiment in 11:41 which recalls the "Vision of Sir Launfal" and the words "the gift without the giver is bare." Luke alone tells the story of the Good Samaritan (10:25–37). The whole parable of the Foolish Rich Man (12:13–21) is also peculiar to Luke. Notice how much of Jesus' teaching about money appears in Luke's Gospel, so much that it has been sometimes thought to show the influence of the Ebionites, an early Christian sect whose teachings

glorified poverty. It might seem more probable that they drew upon Luke to support their views than that their emphasis influenced the Gospel, were it not known that the only gospel they accepted was that of Matthew. A number of scholars have written upon this topic, reaching varying conclusions. Some member of the discussion group should make a careful collection and interpretation of the passages in Luke relating to wealth and poverty and report his findings to the group, or undertake this later as a piece of independent study. We should spare no pains to find out as exactly as we can what Jesus taught. Luke gives in 13:1–10 examples of Jesus' teaching which no other evangelist records, though these are perhaps political rather than religious in their intent. Jesus expects a general calamity to befall Israel as a result of its failure to repent (13:1–5), illustrating further by the parable of the barren fig tree (13:6–9). We cannot be sure whether the impending national calamity is thought of as a destruction of the nation by the Romans brought on by the Jewish revolutionary spirit (zealotism), or whether it is regarded as to be sent upon his hearers by God as a punishment for their irreligion. In any case, repentance alone will prevent the disaster. Jesus' free attitude toward the Sabbath is shown in the account of the cure of a demon-possessed woman (13:10–17) on that day, and the argument Jesus

adduces. Another incident with the same motive follows (14:1–6). Jesus satirizes the vanity of his fellow-guests at a feast and advises humility (14: 7–11; cf. Prov. 25:7). Those who give banquets should invite the poor who can make no return, such an act being rewarded in the future life (14: 12–14). The fifteenth chapter of Luke contains some of Jesus' best-known religious teaching and hardly any of it appears in the other gospels, though the same criticism which calls it out appears elsewhere and is more briefly answered by Jesus (Mark 2:16–17; Matt. 9:11–12; Luke 5:30–32). The parables of the Lost Sheep, the Lost Coin, and the Prodigal Son are all aimed at the Pharisees and Scribes, and intended as a rebuke of their religious exclusiveness, Jesus' contention being that God cared more about the people they held in contempt than he cared about them. It is said they had a saying, "There is joy before God when those who provoke him perish from the world." Jesus' assertion is, "There is joy before God when those who provoke him repent." One represents the hard, proud, narrow legalistic attitude of a self-congratulating religionist, the other the exasperation aroused by it in one who really understood and cared for men. Some questions may help make us clear on Jesus' teaching here. Does he mean that God is better pleased with one thief who becomes an honest man than with ninety-nine honest men who

have never been thieves? Is this putting a premium on honesty or on thievery? Does Jesus speak ironically when he mentions "men who need no repentance"? Or is the point made in all these three parables the strong language of hyperbole? Does the elder brother represent the Scribes and Pharisees? Is the emphasis and meaning generally put upon the parable of the Prodigal Son a wholesome one? Is the work of religion on the whole to recall prodigal sons or to keep them from becoming prodigal sons? What is the object of religious work?

In the parable of the Unjust Steward (16:1–13) Luke gives a teaching none of the other gospels records. The point seems to be the same as that made in 12:33, and 14:13–14, viz., use or dispose of wealth in such a way as to win advantage for yourself in the next life. In the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus (16:19–31) we have a phase of Jesus' teaching that only Luke mentions. The twenty-fifth chapter of Matthew describes the doom of the rejected at the messianic judgment, but this passage in Luke attributes to Jesus a view as to the conditions of the after-life under ordinary circumstances. Note, too, that it reflects the hostility to wealth and glorification of poverty that is so marked a characteristic of this Gospel. The disciples are to think of their service only as a doing of duty (17:7–10). Luke's Gospel emphasizes

Jesus' sympathetic feeling for non-Jewish peoples. It is this which causes his rejection at Nazareth (4:16–30). The hero of the famous parable in 10:30–36 was a Samaritan, while the two Jews in the story play a dishonorable part. He rebukes James and John when they meditate the destruction of a Samaritan village (9:51–55). Luke omits Jesus' directions to the disciples to avoid entering any gentile or Samaritan village and his limitation of his own ministry to the Jews (cf. Matt. 15:24), as well as the story of the Greek woman to whom Jesus speaks of the Gentiles as "dogs" (Mark 7:27; Matt. 15:26). So also in the account of the ten lepers (17:11–19) the one whom Jesus approves is a Samaritan.

Jesus foresees a period of terror and calamity before his return as the Son of Man (17:22–37). He urges persistency in prayer (18:1–8). He regards humility as necessary to the offering of acceptable prayer (18:9–14). He declares salvation has come to a man who has begun to right his social relationships (19:1–10). The time preceding his return as Son of Man is a period of opportunity, which may or may not be utilized (19:11–27). In the conversation on the road to Emmaus after the resurrection Jesus argues that his sufferings were predicted in the earlier Jewish literature (24:13–27). The same idea recurs later with the addition of an instruction to undertake

a world-wide evangelistic effort beginning at Jerusalem (24:47).

Recapitulation.—Summarizing briefly Luke's record of what Jesus taught about religion we may say this Gospel contains much we have noted already in the other gospels, though he has considerable new material. He has eighteen parables that the other gospels do not mention. These largely emphasize ideas not contained in Mark and Matthew. Jesus' religious precocity; the extent of forgiveness as the measure of love; foreigners the object of Jesus' special favor; Jesus the recipient of special authority and knowledge from God; love for one's neighbor to be shown by helping wherever there is need; prayer to be insistent; the folly of hoarding, and the use of money in such a way as to win a favorable place in the next life; the deliberate counting of the cost of discipleship; God's delight in the conversion of sinners greater than his pleasure in the "righteous"; the depicting of the conditions of the tortured and the happy in the next life; a disciple's service only duty; successful prayer dependent on humility; the intervening period before Jesus' return one of opportunity for which the disciples will be held accountable; Jesus after his resurrection reproving the disciples for failing to interpret correctly the Old Testament predictions; these are all new elements which only Luke presents.

RECAPITULATION OF THE TEACHING AS GIVEN BY MARK, MATTHEW, AND LUKE

Bringing together now our findings in Mark, Matthew, and Luke and arranging them under topics we discover:

1. As to God: Jesus assumed the existence of God and believed him to be a heavenly Father, who is kindly, provident, aware of the smallest matters, impartial, all-powerful, interested in the establishment of the Kingdom, amenable to persuasion.

2. As to prayer to God: Jesus himself prayed; he taught his disciples a form of prayer; he recommended that prayer be solitary; he believed that undoubting confidence guaranteed the answer of prayer even to the extent of the uprooting of trees and the transfer of mountains; he regarded persistence as certain to make prayer effectual.

3. As to a future life: Jesus taught the doctrine of a future life, basing his argument for it, as is supposed, upon a verb in Exod. 3:6, and describing it to the extent of denying that in the future life the relationship of marriage is to continue. No indication is given as to his idea of the manner or date of the resurrection except that it seems to precede his return as Son of Man. The life after death he thinks of as continuous, since the condition of those upon whom he pronounces judgment is that of eternal comfort or misery.

4. As to sin and its forgiveness: Jesus regards himself as capable of forgiving sins; he empowers his disciples to do the same; he urges his hearers to be forgiving; he declares God's forgiveness of a man to be dependent upon that man's forgiving those who had injured him; to attribute the power residing in him to diabolic influence seems to him an unforgivable offense.

5. As to salvation: Jesus uses the term salvation only once in the Synoptic Gospels (Luke 19:9) and designates by it participation in the Kingdom, the right to such participation resting in Zacchaeus' case upon the two facts of his righting of his social relationship and of his Jewish nationality. Compare for the same nationalistic emphasis in regard to salvation the only other passage in which the term is ascribed to Jesus (John 4:22).

6. As to character: Jesus lauded qualities usually disparaged, such as voluntary poverty, sadness, lack of self-assertion, unpopularity, resignation to one's fate, non-resistance. Success according to Jesus' ideal did not consist in acquiring wealth or learning or control over men. It lay in confidence in the Father's care, patient acceptance of his will, selfless service of others, absorption in the interests of the Kingdom.

7. As to social relationships: Jesus' religion was one of personal relationships—of men to God and of men to men. His whole teaching centers in

the concept of an ideal society, the Kingdom of God. Although according to the gospel representations he expected this to be established in a supernatural and cataclysmic way, it was when completed to be an earthly community, organized on the basis of the Jewish tribal divisions and composed of men of the Kingdom type. Moreover, in the intervening period before the Kingdom's establishment at his own return the disciples were to carry on a campaign of propaganda and win men to the Kingdom life, though, in so doing, some would, like himself, suffer persecution and death.

Out of what Jesus taught about religion have come the great ideas of universal friendliness between men and universal reverence toward God, that are expressed in the phrases, the fatherhood of God, and the brotherhood of men. Brotherhood is now taking on more of the technical, concrete meaning. As there is the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, there will some day be a Brotherhood of Man—a league of humanity organized for mutual protection, improvement, and self-help. This will be the next step toward the realization of Jesus' great ideal.

CHAPTER IX

WHAT JESUS TAUGHT ABOUT HIMSELF

The teaching of Jesus, and the teaching about Jesus.—The literature that springs up about any great leader consists of three elements, being the record or discussion of his acts, his ideas, and the views held about him by others. It is easy to see how these may blend into each other so that his action expresses ideas, and the views of partisans insensibly color the record of his own teaching. Thus it is often pointed out that in the gospels we have both the teaching *of* Jesus and the teaching *about* Jesus. To separate them is a subtle task, and one in which the personal equation is likely to determine the conclusion. It is sometimes said that "Jesus stands head and shoulders above his reporters," and that we are to attribute to Jesus such teachings as could not have come from any lesser person, and relieve him of any which fall below our feeling of what is appropriate to his character. This, it is obvious, makes our view of what Jesus taught on any point to be governed not by all the evidence available, but by what is in keeping with our ideal. For a study such as ours, as we agreed in the beginning, it is better to take all the evidence the Synoptic Gospels give on every point

and build it into a compact statement, and, as inferences are likely to vary, leave each member of the discussion group to draw his own. More important than immediate conclusions and formulated opinions is the impartial consideration of evidence. We shall therefore examine the gospels to see what they record as Jesus' teaching about himself.

Our method.—For brevity's sake we must use such phrases as Jesus teaches, Jesus thinks, Jesus believes, etc., meaning, as throughout all our discussions, that as we understand the gospel passages they represent Jesus as so teaching, thinking, believing, etc.

THE TEACHING IN MARK

Summary of Mark's report.—Mark tells of Jesus' baptism, temptation, and early Kingdom preaching in Galilee without mention of any teaching of Jesus about himself. The first instance of this comes in Jesus' choice of Simon and Andrew to be his disciples or students (1:17). Compare the familiar story of how Socrates called Xenophon by barring the young man's way in a narrow passage with his staff and asking where this and that could be bought, ending with, "Where can Wisdom be bought?" Upon Xenophon saying he did not know, Socrates said, "Come with me and I will teach you." Thus in this first statement, "Come

you after me, and I will make you to become fishers of men," Jesus shows a belief in his power to lead men and gives evidence of having a thought-out plan of action. This self-confidence is also shown in his teaching (1:22). He feels the pressure of his duty to present the Kingdom message from village to village (1:38). He tries in vain to avoid publicity (1:43–45). He calls himself the Son of Man and claims to have the power of forgiving sins, using a healing to substantiate his claim (2:10–11). As to the meaning of the term Son of Man, opinions differ. Some scholars regard it as a name for the expected Messiah which was in popular use at the time, and which Jesus adopted and applied to himself. Others question whether there is sufficient evidence to show that it was thus used before Jesus' time and incline to the view that Jesus employed the term in a sense based on its Old Testament use, meaning by it to say, "I am a Man," that is, that he thought of himself as representative of all the qualities and subject to all the obligations that obtain, not merely in the case of an individual man, but of all humanity. The difficulty lies in the lack of evidence as to contemporary usage. The Old Testament furnishes no example of the term the "Son of Man" as a title for the Messiah or any other person. Ezekiel is called Son of Man (33:1, 7, 10, and elsewhere), and the term is sometimes used in a poetic way, meaning humanity, mankind

(Ps. 8:4; Dan. 7:13). In the gospels it is used only by Jesus and in reference to himself. Aside from the Old and New Testaments we must depend largely upon the evidence of the Book of Enoch. In it the phrase Son of Man occurs frequently as a name for the Messiah. Professor R. H. Charles, who has edited this book and is a foremost scholar in the field of apocalyptic literature, dates those portions of the book which contain this term (the so-called Similitudes) about 105–64 B.C.[1]

Jesus thinks of his mission as limited to a definite class among the Jews, viz., the "sinners," that is, those who were lax in their religious observances (2:17). Jesus regards the joy or sadness of the disciples as being controlled by his own presence or absence (2:18–22). It is possible that in his reference to the Sabbath (2:28) he is asserting, not his own personal superiority to the Sabbath legislation, but the general truth that the interests of mankind take precedence over punctilio in religious customs. He asserts himself as a leader in appointing the Twelve as field preachers and exorcists (3:13–19). Consciousness of his unique powers is shown in 3:27. He has the highest reverence for that influence of God under which he works and by which he is empowered (3:28–30). He is astonished at and thwarted by the resistance of his

[1] See Charles, *The Book of Enoch*, 2d ed., 1912, p. xi.

fellow-townsmen (6:1–6). He sends out his twelve disciples in six pairs on a tour of preaching and healing (6:7–13). Jesus' fame spreads and he is thought to be John the Baptist or Elijah come to life again, or a new prophet (6:14–15). He speaks with aggressiveness and certitude (7:14). He thinks of his ministry as properly limited to the Jews (7:27). He tries again in vain to avoid publicity (7:36; cf. also 8:27). He expresses his pity for the hungry and weary crowds that have followed him (8:1–3). In Caesarea-Philippi in northern Palestine he questions the disciples as to the popular opinions concerning him, whereupon Peter declares his belief that Jesus is the Messiah (8:27–28). This passage is often called the "Great Confession." Jesus now warns the disciples of his approaching rejection and death, and predicts his resurrection (8:31). He calls upon all who would be his disciples to make a full renunciation even of life itself (8:34). He enjoins the three not to tell what they have seen on the Mount of Transfiguration until after the resurrection (9:9). He believes his sufferings to be foretold in Old Testament prophecy (9:12). He repeats his prediction of his arrest, death, and resurrection (9:31). Kindness shown a child he accepts as a kindness done to himself and as a service of God (9:37). Notice the similar passage in 10:13–16. He accepts as his supporters any who follow his principles, even

though they may not attach themselves to the company of his disciples (9:38–40). Those who befriend or injure his disciples will be rewarded or punished (9:40–41). His sense of leadership shows itself strongly in his proposal to a rich man that he give his wealth to charity and become his disciple (10:17–22). At the same time he declines to be himself called "good" (10:18). He believes that those who sacrifice for his sake will be vastly rewarded later in the Kingdom (10:28–31). He again predicts his betrayal, death, and resurrection (10:32–34). He tests the willingness of James and John to undergo the sufferings he will himself endure, but disclaims ability to appoint them to the chief places in the Kingdom (10:35–40). His mission is to serve and to give up his life for others (10:45). He plans a dramatic entry into Jerusalem and accepts the enthusiastic shoutings of his adherents (11:1–10). He blasts a fig tree because it has no fruit, although it was not the time of year for figs. Later he draws from the incident a lesson on the possibilities of undoubting prayer (11:12–14, 20–24). By a shrewd question he silences his critics (11:27–32). In the parable of the Wicked Husbandmen he refers to himself as the son of the vineyard owner and forecasts his own death and subsequent triumph (12:1–12).

From Ps. 110:1 Jesus argues that the Messiah is not to be thought of as a descendant of David,

since David applies to him the respectful title of "Lord," which would be a reversal of the customary relationship of respect between ancestor and descendant (12:35–37).[1] He asserts his ignorance of the day of the catastrophic establishment of the Kingdom, but thinks of it as coming in a few years (13:32; cf. vs. 30). The act of the woman who anointed him is to be heralded over the whole world (14:3–9). He predicts his betrayal by one of the Twelve (14:18–20), regarding it as the fulfilment of Scripture, but not considering the betrayer to be thereby relieved from responsibility (14:18–20). The bread and wine at the Last Supper are foretokens of his approaching doom (14:22–25). In Gethsemane he prays to be delivered from it, but is willing to undergo it if God wills (14:32–36), and recognizes that his hour has now come (14:41). He protests against his secret arrest, but sees in it a fulfilment of Scripture (14:48–49). At the trial Jesus declares himself the Messiah and predicts his return upon the clouds (14:61–62). On the cross he loses the sense of God's support (15:34). The present ending of Mark (16:9–20) is not regarded as the original ending of the Gospel. Other endings

[1] That Jesus understood the use of the rabbinic method of argument with its subtle interpretations of Scripture appears also in other passages: for example, his proof of the continued life of the dead, Mark 12:26–27; Luke 20:27, basing it on Exod. 3:6; his argument against divorce, Mark 10:5–8; Matt. 19:4–8, basing it on Gen. 1:27.

exist, but none of these is thought to be the original. It is one of the romantic possibilities of New Testament science that some day the missing ending of Mark may be discovered. For completeness, however, let us add the evidence of this conclusion added by a later hand as to what Jesus taught about himself. After the resurrection he appears to the eleven, reproaches them for their tardiness in crediting his resurrection, instructs them to evangelize the world, and mentions the miraculous powers that shall be enjoyed by believers.

Recapitulation.—Summarizing Jesus' teaching about himself as it appears in Mark, we note that Jesus regards his personal mission as limited to the Jews, and tries to avoid publicity, though he later inaugurates a campaign of world-wide propaganda. He employs the Twelve in propagating the Kingdom message. He is interested to know the popular impression he is creating and elicits from Peter the "Great Confession." He repeatedly predicts his arrest, sufferings, and death. He calls himself the Son of Man and in various ways asserts his sense of his own significance. His mission is to save others at the cost of his own life. He regards certain incidents of his life as having been predicted in the Old Testament. He asserts his messiahship and believes he will later return upon the clouds.

THE TEACHING IN MATTHEW

Summary of Matthew's report.—Matthew, in the Sermon on the Mount, mentions Jesus' early recognition that the disciples' relation to himself was likely to entail persecution for them (5:11). He strongly asserts his loyalty to the Mosaic Law (5:17–20). He knows that men's welfare depends upon their acceptance of and action upon his teachings (7:24–27). He mentions his poverty (8:20), in the same connection demanding extreme devotion to his leadership (8:21–22). He asserts his power to forgive sins (9:6). He calls Matthew to discipleship by a simple command (10:9). His mission is to the non-religious (9:13). His presence or absence makes or mars the disciples' joy (9:15). The tenth chapter of Matthew abounds in the use of the first person by Jesus. His general attitude is one of assertion and command. In response to John the Baptist's query as to whether he was the expected Messiah, Jesus calls attention to the miracles he performs and congratulates those who do not disagree with him (11:2–6). He refers to his own free habits in eating and drinking and the criticism it occasions (11:9). In a passage which sounds strangely like the Gospel of John, Jesus claims to be endowed with extraordinary authority and to be gifted with unique knowledge of God (11:26–27). He defends himself against the charge of being possessed by the chief of the demons, Beelze-

bub, and denounces the suggestion as an unpardonable sin (12:27–32). He declares himself greater than the prophet Jonah, greater even than King Solomon (12:41–42). Whoever does God's will he regards as closely related to himself (12:46–50). Jesus proclaims the Kingdom message (13:37). At the judgment Jesus will send forth angels over the earth to gather out all unsuitable persons from the Kingdom for destruction (13:41). To a gentile woman who asks him to exorcise a demon from her daughter Jesus replies that his mission is limited to the Jews (15:24). He expresses a strong feeling of sympathetic interest in the crowds that follow him (15:32). Near Caesarea-Philippi, Jesus inquires from the disciples what the popular view concerning himself is, and Peter declares his conviction that Jesus is the Messiah (16:13–16). This passage, it is pointed out, argues against the claim that Son of Man was a current phrase meaning Messiah. If Jesus had been calling himself constantly by a title which people in general would recognize as equivalent to Messiah, why would he regard Peter's recognition that he was Messiah as the result of a special revelation? Also why would he enjoin secrecy upon the disciples as to his messiahship? (16:20.)

Following Peter's "Great Confession" Jesus predicts his sufferings, death, and resurrection, and foresees his return accompanied by angels and acting as Judge of Mankind (16:21–28; 17:12, 22).

To show kindness to a child is to show kindness to Jesus himself (18:5). Children were brought to Jesus with the request that he put his hands on them and pray. The disciples object, but Jesus instructs them that the children are not to be turned away (19:13–14). To a man who queries as to what good thing he shall do to insure eternal life Jesus suggests that God is the only one deserving to be called good (19:17). Jesus' assertion of command over men is shown in his requirement that this man give his wealth to the poor and join Jesus' band of wandering preachers (19:20). To the Twelve who have followed him Jesus promises thrones and tribal judgeships in the Kingdom, while all who have sacrificed for him are to be repaid a hundred times over besides becoming immortal (19:28–30). He describes in detail his approaching condemnation and execution (20:18–19). The authority of disposing the places of chief distinction in the Kingdom has not been committed to Jesus (20:23). In the same verse he alludes to his coming sufferings and intimates that James and John will ultimately share his own fate. His mission is to serve others by his life and death (19:28). Jesus' astuteness in debate is shown in his defeat of the religious leaders who demand to know the source of his authority (21:24–27). By the parable of the Wicked Husbandmen he asserts himself to be God's favorite representative and conveys a

threat of coming disaster to those who reject his claims (21:33–46). He asserts his relation to the disciples to be that of a teacher and master (23:8, 10). During the calamities that precede his return the disciples are to beware of impostors who will themselves perform miracles (24:24). After terrible portents have been seen in earth and sky he is to appear in the clouds accompanied by angels (24:30–31). The exact date of this is, however, unknown to him (24:36). His return will be unexpected and he counsels perpetual preparation for it (24:44, 45–51; 25:1–30). At the Judgment, Jesus will be the arbiter of the fate of the non-Jewish world, assigning eternal joy or misery according to the attitude men have shown to the Jewish people (25:31–46).

Jesus knows that his death is to take place at the Passover period and for the last time warns the disciples of it, two days before the event (26:2). At the Last Supper he points out Judas as the one who will cause his arrest (26:24–25). In Gethsemane he prays to be delivered but is submissive to God's will (26:39–43). He believes he could at the last summon myriads of angels for his protection; protests against this secret arrest when he had taught in public unmolested, but regards the whole event as a necessary fulfilment of Scripture (26:53–56). At the trial before Caiaphas, Jesus again asserts his unique relation to God and de-

scribes his return upon the clouds (26:64). On the cross he loses his feeling of God's presence and cries aloud (27:46). After the resurrection Jesus appoints a rendezvous with the disciples in Galilee, at which time he asserts his supreme authority and instructs them to evangelize the world (28:10, 16–20).

Recapitulation.—Summing up Matthew's report of Jesus' teaching concerning himself, we find Jesus strongly conscious of his own significance; making insistent demand for devotion to himself and his cause; asserting his power to forgive sins; affirming extraordinary, if not omnipotent powers and unique relationship to God; claiming superiority to Jonah and Solomon; calling himself the Son of Man and proclaiming an apocalyptic program which included his return upon the clouds with angels, that return being preceded by terrific calamities and followed by a world-judgment; expressing sympathy with crowds and forbidding interference with the children who were brought to him; giving assurance that those who sacrifice for his sake will be abundantly rewarded; repeatedly predicting his sufferings, death, and resurrection, sometimes in considerable detail; warning the disciples against impostors during the calamitous days preceding his return and counseling watchfulness and preparation; as seeing in the closing events of his life a fulfilment of Scripture; as praying to escape his sufferings,

but yielding to the Father's will; as believing himself able to summon hosts of angels to save him from arrest; as losing upon the cross his sustaining sense of the presence of God; as limiting his own ministry to the Jews, but after his resurrection sending the disciples out to evangelize the world.

THE TEACHING IN LUKE

Summary of Luke's report.—Luke's first record of a teaching of Jesus about himself narrates his reply to his mother in which he refers to the Temple as his Father's house (2:49), a remark which taken in connection with his boyhood interest in the Jewish law has been thought to show that Jesus enjoyed a special sense of relationship to God even from a very early age. He anticipates opposition in his own city and in his synagogue address angers his fellow-townsman by his pro-gentile attitude (4:23–30). He feels the urge of his mission as a preacher of the Kingdom (4:43). As in Mark and Matthew, Jesus demonstrates his power to forgive sins by curing a paralytic (5:24–25). He speaks of his presence or absence as determining the joy or sorrow of the disciples (5:34). His sense of ability to command appears in his call of Levi (5:27). He feels a special mission to the irreligious (5:32). He anticipates persecution on his account for the disciples (6:22). Action upon, or failure to act upon, his teachings determines men's future for

weal or woe (6:46–49). As an answer to John the Baptist's query, he cites the miracles he has performed and felicitates those who are not repelled by him (7:18–23). He compares unfavorably the lack of attentions shown him by Simon the Pharisee with the devotion of the woman who anointed him with costly ointment (7:44–50). As in the other Synoptic Gospels he calls those his kin who do God's will (8:19–21). Questioning the disciples as to the popular opinion concerning him he elicits from Peter the reply that he is God's Messiah, a statement which he instructs them to keep secret (9:20–21). He predicts his own rejection, death, and resurrection (9:22) and calls upon his followers for devotion to the death (9:23–25). His return in glory is not far distant (9:26–27). He will permit nothing to prevent obedience to the peremptory demand of discipleship (9:57–62). Welcome or rejection of the disciples upon their preaching tour is tantamount to a welcome or rejection of himself (10:16). He confers upon the seventy superhuman abilities over snakes, scorpions, and demons (10:19). The "Johannine" passage mentioned above in treating of Matthew's account of Jesus' teaching appears also in Luke (10:22–23). He makes the same argument against the charge of demon possession that appears in Mark and Matthew (11:17–22), though in Luke the remark in reference to the unpardonable sin is transferred to a

later point (12:10). As before, Jesus asserts his superiority to Jonah and Solomon (11:30–32). He refuses to act as arbitrator in a family difficulty over an inheritance (12:14). He warns the disciples to be ready for his future coming (12:40). He realizes the divisive and revolutionary character of his teaching (12:49–53). At his return there will be those whose unpreparedness will bring about their rejection (13:23–30). Jesus meets nonchalantly the Pharisee's warning as to Herod's desire to put him to death, regarding himself as "immortal till his work was done" (13:31–32). In the intermediate period before his return the disciples will wish longingly for days like those they are now enjoying in his presence. Indifference and preoccupation will mark social life before his return which will be sudden and destructive (17:22–36). He welcomes children (18:16); denies the right to be called "good," a term applicable to God alone (18:19); proposes voluntary poverty and discipleship to a rich inquirer (18:22). In the parable of the Wicked Husbandmen he lays claim to a unique relationship to God (20:13) and predicts dire punishment to the nation for rejecting him (20:15–18). Before his return many impostors will arise, impersonating himself (21:8). Adherence to him will entail persecution for the disciples (21:12, 17). After the period of calamity, he will appear upon a cloud in power and glory (21:27). They are to

pray for fortitude to endure the intermediate days of testing (21:36). At the Last Supper he uses bread and wine as tokens of his approaching death (22:19–20). He promises the Twelve thrones and judgeships over the twelve tribes of Israel (22:29–30). In Gethsemane, Jesus prays for deliverance from his approaching suffering, but yields to the Father's will (22:42). As in Matthew he protests against the secrecy of his arrest as not in keeping with his own bold and public teaching (22:52–53). Before the Sanhedrin he asserts his favored relation to God, a statement that is taken as blasphemy (22:67–71). On the way to the cross Jesus addresses the women along the way, predicting a period of terror that is approaching (23:27–31). On the cross he promises one of his fellow-sufferers a place in Paradise (23:43). Luke omits Jesus' despairing cry, "My God! My God! Why hast thou forsaken me?" and gives the confident utterance, "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit" (23:46). On the walk to Emmaus after the resurrection he upbraids his companions for their failure to understand the Old Testament passages relating to him and his sufferings, following this by his own interpretation of them (24:24–27). He demonstrates the reality of his body to the incredulous disciples (24:39–40). He appoints the disciples to the task of world-evangelization. Forgiveness of sins is to be preached in his name. He

will presently endow the disciples with extraordinary powers promised by the Father (24:49).

Recapitulation.—By way of summary of Luke's presentation of Jesus' teaching about himself we note that it agrees largely with that of Mark and Matthew, the material peculiar to Luke not adding appreciably to the other gospels' report in this particular. Jesus is marked throughout Luke by a sense of significance, strength and command; he realizes his importance to the disciples and the explosive and dangerous nature of his message; he counts those as relatives who do God's will; he forbids the disciples to make known their belief in his messiahship until after the resurrection, though on occasion he does not shrink from declaring it himself; he endows certain of his followers with supernatural powers of resistance to venom and with ability to exorcise demons; he anticipates his sufferings, passion, and resurrection; he looks forward to his return upon the clouds after the period of catastrophe. He promises distinction to the disciples in the established Kingdom. He believes the Old Testament to contain predictions of his sufferings and their significance.

RECAPITULATION OF THE TEACHING AS GIVEN BY MARK, MATTHEW, AND LUKE

We are now ready to assemble in as compact a statement as we can the results of our examination

of Mark, Matthew, and Luke as to what Jesus taught about himself. We may best gather our findings under subtopics.

1. His sense of personal significance. Jesus in his teaching about himself shows a stupendous assertiveness. He can forgive sins; he is given power from God to do miracles; he is all in all to his disciples; he has special intimacy with and understanding of God; he calls men to discipleship peremptorily and will not abide delay; he disregards long-established religious customs; he extends and spiritualizes the Mosaic Law; to attribute the source of his powers to a demonic agency he regards as an unpardonable sin; he is the chief figure in the Kingdom of God, which to all intents and purposes is really a Kingdom of Jesus; he expects to return some time after his resurrection on the clouds with angels and act as judge over the eternal destinies of the gentile world, while the Twelve act as judges of the Jews.

2. His controlling purpose in life. In the gospels studied Jesus regards his mission as a ministry. This word has lost its luster through professionalization, but a moment's thinking brings out its meaning. Jesus declares himself sent to service. The pressure of his feeling keeps him from unduly prolonging his stay in a single city; it moves him to compassion over crowds of tired and hungry men; it leads him to multiply his efforts through the

seventy and the Twelve. His death, too, he conceived was a necessary part of God's program for him and influential in some way in recalling men to right living.

As in other instances, we face here the difficulty of the probable intermixture of the views of the early Christians along with the actual teaching of Jesus. In the Fourth Gospel this process, of which the Synoptics bear traces, is carried so far as to convince many New Testament scholars that its representation of Jesus' teaching about himself must be regarded as almost wholly the creation of its author or of the group to which he belonged. Back of all the representations, however, we sense a personality so admirable, so commanding, that we too are glad to be his disciples.

CHAPTER X

WHAT JESUS TAUGHT: THE HOPE OF THE WORLD

To assert Christianity's superiority a natural claim.—Offhand, we who have been brought up in a Christian environment are ready to affirm that Christianity is the hope of the world. However, if we had been brought up in Mohammedanism or Buddhism, the other great missionary religions, we should probably say the same thing about the religion we knew, for, generally speaking, people think as they are taught to think. If we were Jews, enthusiastic and devoted as the Jewish people are, we should regard Judaism as teaching the truth the world needs for its salvation; being Christians, we say Christianity, rather than any other religion, is the hope of the world. We are, however, under no obligation to regard our natural attitude with suspicion, merely because it is natural. We wish only to assure ourselves by reviewing some of the things that make such an assertion rational at a time when Christianity is twenty centuries old and seems to be standing on the threshold of a new and greater Reformation.

WHAT IS THE WORLD-HOPE

Lest we move in a mist of uncertainty and come to no landing-place, let us make definite to our-

selves what we mean by the world-hope and, also, what we understand by Christianity. First, as to the world-hope. Those who are able to view life in a large way tell us that human society has passed through various stages of development upon a gradually ascending scale. The process has been a slow one. At times certain civilizations have outstripped their neighbors and made a great place in history. For various reasons they have then grown weak, and younger and more virile nations have taken their place. Now and again devastating wars, or a breakdown of national character, have delayed the process or development. But in general, progress has been made. Though beaten back here and there, humanity has been gradually and painfully rising. Now what is the goal of the social process? Toward what is history tending?

Two answers: the catastrophic and the evolutionary.—To this question two answers are given. One is that history is to end in a cataclysm of failure. The world is essentially bad and its condition is hopeless. It is like a house on fire from which only a few precious articles can be saved. Our business as Christian leaders is to save what we can and wait patiently for the wind-up of history at the second coming of Christ, which, we are assured, is close upon us. The second answer is both less dramatic and in some respects less comforting. It looks forward to an indefinite future, during

which the human family will continue its slow upward journey for millions upon millions of years. It thinks of the ideal state of society as a state to be attained as the present one has been, by persistent constructive effort on the part of men.

Can Christianity meet the evolutionary view?—If this view be the one that history shall show to be correct, does Christianity give an adequate answer to the question, What is the goal of the social process? It does. When Christianity lay as a germ, an idea, in the mind of its founder, it had in it that answer in the spiritual elements of Jesus' conception of the Kingdom of God. When that state of society has been attained all over the planet in which human beings live together on terms of honesty, sympathy, kindness, helpfulness, service, reverence, and all that we put into the ideal term brotherhood, which far transcends what we actually have known among brothers, and when human beings all over the planet revere and worship one holy, just, and kindly God, in whom are lodged all the virtues we put into the ideal term fatherhood, which far transcends what we have actually known among fathers, then man will have become superman and the Kingdom of God will have come.

It is this world-hope of a perfected society, when, in the phrase of the Apocalypse, the new Jerusalem is let down from God upon earth and the habitation of God is with men, which thrills the

hearts of many Christians today. They see in Christianity an ideal which is sufficient to give them a rational explanation of what has been called the "riddle of the universe."

WHAT IS CHRISTIANITY?

1. **The church.**—We turn now to the second question we set before ourselves: What is Christianity? This is not an easy question, to be answered in an instant. Definition is always a task of surprising difficulty, particularly so when the definition proposes to delimit the elusive outlines of spiritual realities. "What is Christianity? has called forth monographs and whole volumes. Of the various answers that suggest themselves, two may be considered. First, it may be said Christianity is an objective organization functioning in society, i.e., Christianity is historically the church. When we speak of the spread of Christianity in the Roman Empire we mean that from village to village and from city to city the new religion spread until everywhere there were groups of Christians. If in the province of Galatia in 54 A.D. there were 10 churches and 1,000 Christians, and in 64 A.D. there were 20 churches and 2,000 Christians, we should say that Christianity had been spreading. Out of simple beginnings a powerful ecclesiastical organization developed so that historically and objectively for some fifteen cen-

turies Christianity was the Catholic church. For 400 years Christianity has taken also another form, so that the phase most familiar to us is Protestantism. When Christianity spreads in its Protestant form it means that Protestant churches are being organized and communicants are increasing. If in China in 1870 there are 200 churches and 20,000 Christians and in 1880 there were 300 churches and 30,000 Christians, we should say Christianity is spreading. Historically and objectively for 400 years Christianity to Protestants has meant the extension of organized churches and increase in church membership. Christianity spreads as churches spread and members increase. What then is Christianity? From this point of view it is an ecclesiastical organization, Catholic or Protestant.

2. **A system of belief.**—From a second point of view, Christianity is a faith, the acceptance of a statement or system of belief. Thus when we speak of a Confucianist's accepting Christianity, we mean that he has come to regard as true the doctrinal statements made by Christian representatives or publications. Christianity is thought of as a series of propositions whose truth is divinely guaranteed. When a man believes them he becomes a Christian. On the mission fields this presentation of Christianity has frequently been the accepted method. Christianity in this sense spreads as

additional individuals come to give credence to its doctrines.

3. **A way of behavior.**—Still a third answer to this question occurs to some. Christianity they say is a quality of life, a way of behavior. It may or may not reside in an organization. The act or attitude of an individual or corporation may or may not be Christian, irrespective of names or titles. The acts of the same man or corporation may at times be Christian and at other times not Christian. Men may be partly Christianized. They may be Christianized in their ecclesiastical relations, but not in their commercial relations; they may be Christianized in their general social relations, but un-Christian in their domestic relations, or vice versa. They may be Christian in their relations to one sex, but not to the other. They may be Christian in their relations with compatriots, but un-Christian in their relations with foreigners. Partial Christianization is the common characteristic and common calamity of us all. Failure to recognize that life is made Christian inch by inch and that a man may be Christian in one department of his being and not in another creates both misunderstanding of ourselves and accusation of others. Our ideal is to be pan-Christians. Christianity, from this point of view, is an idealization of human relationships. It consists in an attitude toward life's ultimate realities, self, others,

and God. This highly spiritual conception of Christianity as socialized behavior would admit of one's being a Christian while at the same time remaining a Jew or a Buddhist.[1]

It is not likely that any one of these answers is altogether wrong. Christianity may well be all three, organization, conviction, and behavior. Just now we stress the last, knowing that it will bring the others after it. It is just as true that action molds belief as that belief controls action.

4. What Jesus taught.—A fourth answer which may be taken as including all the others is this: Christianity, on its thought side, is what Jesus taught minus the intermingled apocalypticism of the gospels and plus all development of ideas implicit in his teaching or in harmony with the highest representations of his spirit. It is the Kingdom teaching in its spiritual and ethical statement expressing itself in ways suited to the needs and in accordance with the knowledge of any given time. As to its organization, it may take any form that approves itself as effective. As a way of behavior it consists in doing all in human power to serve humanity and raise the standard of human life.

Summary of working principles.—Summing up the working principles suggested by our study

[1] For an exact parallel in the spiritual conception of Judaism, see Paul's remark in Rom. 2:28–29.

of what Jesus taught we may state them as follows:

1. The human emphasis. In all situations the most important element is the human one, that is the human beings affected. Employers are learning this and are thinking, not only of the quality and quantity of the product, but of the effect of the process upon the character of the employee. It is easy to fall into the way of thinking that the trivial matter of routine we happen to be engaged in is more important than the human being whose need presents a temporary interruption. Such an attitude may well be represented by the priest and the Levite in Jesus' story of the Good Samaritan. Let us settle it forever in our minds that no program or prejudice or theological doctrine is so important as doing bits of human service.

2. The character emphasis. In human beings the most important element is character. Education, native ability, manners, money, are all desirable, but most important of all is that quality of personality which is the result of heredity, environment, and personal decisions, and which at any given moment is the expression of what the person is. As this has largely been made by action, it may be changed by action.

3. The developmental emphasis. Since character is a product, we must constantly think, plan, work, talk, and act in a way calculated to conserve

the good character we and our fellows have attained, and to develop better character. As character is so molded by experience, those who have it in their power to choose experiences for others hold a serious opportunity and responsibility. To provide wholesome, developmental experience is a duty we owe both to others and to ourselves. We must be like a chess-player, thinking several moves ahead, i.e., studying the modification of character likely to be produced. Because it led nowhere, much educational and religious work has been a failure. Here is the preliminary, testing question always: What character changes may I expect this to produce?

4. The religious emphasis. Religion is always a powerful element in shaping character. People have latent religious capacities which rightly developed will make for breadth of interest, depth of conviction, and social usefulness. As planners and builders of the more ideal life of the future, our task is therefore ultimately and essentially a religious one. In the past, religious work has been too largely confined to the communication of opinion. Now religious work is better conceived of as participation in the process of producing an improved type of human living.

5. The individual emphasis. Much of the most effective work we do is in personal conversation. In these conversations there is need of sympathy and understanding rather than dogmatic argument.

Often we help most by just listening. For every person there is a clue to the fullest life, the most complete realizing of himself. Our task is, having first found that clue for ourselves, to help others in finding it for themselves. We can not do it with a formula, for as persons differ methods must. What we want is that every person shall reach his best possibilities. To do that he must Christianize his living, that is, act in accordance with the best ideals accessible to him. As we help people into reverence, prayer, kindliness, courage, cleanness, sincerity, and unselfish action, we shall be helping to realize that Kingdom of which Jesus taught and which, in its ideal, spiritual aspects is still the hope of the world.

Final summary of the course.—We find Jesus' teaching as a part of the Bible, a book which thousands of people of varying types, nationalities, and interests are studying, among whom is our own discussion group. We therefore surveyed the motives that lead people to study the Bible, and decided what our own motive was to be. In beginning any study it is naturally important to get at first a general conception of its character. This is especially necessary in the case of the Bible, because of the influence of one's general conception of its character upon one's religious views. For this reason we discussed that topic, making clear to ourselves what our attitude toward the Bible was to be.

To orientate ourselves further in our study, we considered the world Jesus lived in, as to its constituent elements and its controlling ideas. To avoid the superficial notion that it is perfectly easy to understand the teaching of Jesus, we inquired into the importance and the difficulty of knowing what Jesus taught. We then brought together all his teaching on several topics of present interest, viz., civilization, hate, war and non-resistance, democracy, religion, himself, making a serious effort to understand it and to weigh its value for our own lives, concluding with the present study of the relation of Jesus' teaching to the world's ideal future.

Intellectual honesty and the spirit of our age forbid us to accept without thinking any religious teaching, however ancient and respectable. Freedom to inquire and to investigate is our inherent right, and we do well to insist upon it. To maintain an independent, impersonal attitude, critical in the right sense, is essential to clear thinking and correct conclusions when one deals with historical studies, such as the study of what Jesus taught is. The New Testament, as well as the Old, the reported teaching of Jesus, as well as the reported teaching of Socrates, must approve itself to our reason and our consciences before it can rightly become a norm for our living. If we have been accustomed to suppose it our duty to accept with-

out inquiry what is presented to us as the teaching of Jesus or the Bible or our church, we have not been living up to our intellectual obligations, and are in duty bound to scrutinize the truth and value of these claims and to examine our convictions to see how well founded they are. This is a necessary initial part of the larger constructive process by which we arrive at religious views which are reasonable and tenable and which articulate with our findings in other fields of study and experience. The mere questioning or discarding of views formerly held is not enough, yet people sometimes stop there, not realizing that negation is the mark of a tyro, and that the freedom we need is not freedom to destroy, but freedom to build.

Centuries and millenniums will pass. Millions of years hence people will be living where we live now, a life modified by the changes and improvements that will have been made. But always truth, righteousness, reverence, forgiveness, helpfulness, human interest, modesty, devotion to a great ideal, the love of nature and of little children, enthusiasm over a visioned future, all things that Jesus stood for, will be as real and valuable as they were in his day and as they are now. It is the discovery of these imperishable values that make worth while the study of What Jesus Taught.

INDEX

INDEX

Antiquity of Jesus, 66
Apocrypha: of the New Testament, 35 ff.; of the Old Testament, 32 f.
Apostolic Fathers, 37
Approach: the theological, 69 f.; the historical, 70; the practical, 71
Aramaic, 6

Baraca classes, xx
Bible: a literature, 26; effect of not studying, 18 ff.; languages of, 6; real value of, 42 f.
Bible readers in England, 19 footnote
Bible translation, history of, 41
Biblical ideas, development of, 27 f.
Bibliomancy, 14 ff.

Character building, 16 ff.
Christianity: as the church, 181 f.; a system of belief, 182 f.; a way of behavior, 183 f.; its superiority, 178; what Jesus taught, 184
Civilization: of Jesus' time, 74; Jesus' ideal of, 74 f.; making of, 72 f.; marks of an ideal, 73; meaning of term, 72
Custom, 1

Democracy: Jesus and, 118; fundamental conceptions of, 119 ff.
Demons, 52 f.
Devotion, 16
Discussion group method, 2; essential of, 56

Epictetus, 16, 50
Essentials for successful discussions, xix

Final summary of the course, 187
Fourth Gospel, 177

God in our world, 59 f.
Gospels: doctrinal coloring of, 65; interweaving of documents in, 65
Greek of the New Testament, 8

Habit, 1
Hate: problem of, 101 ff.; Jesus and, 102 ff.
Hebrew of the Old Testament, 6 f.
Historical criticism, 40 f.
History, interest in, 9

Impulsive action, 1

Josephus, 50–52

Kingdom of God, 74–100, *passim*
Kingdom teaching, present value of, 97 f.

Language of Jesus, 64 f.
Literature: definition of, 23; forms of, in the Bible, 28; function of, 25; the Bible a literature, 26

Method of study, 75 ff.
Miracles, views concerning, 53 ff.
Misdirection in Bible-study, 5
Modern versions, 42 f.

Non-resistance: a mediating view of, 109 f.; assumptions regarding and objections to, 110 f.; the truth in and objections, 112 ff.

Obstreperous members, how to handle, xxii

Palestine, history of, 44 ff.; life of, 46; significance of, 45 f.
Prayer, 2
Proof-texts, use of the Bible for, 10 ff.

Rabbinic argument, 164
Reasoned action, 1
Religion: in Palestine, 128 ff.; Jesus a great teacher of, 129; summary of Jesus' teaching concerning, 155 ff.
Résumé of the Old Testament, 29 ff.

Sermon-making, 12 ff.
Sermon on the Mount, 137 ff.
Son of Man, meaning of, 160 f., 167
Source material, meagerness of, 62
Superficiality in Bible-study, 4
Supernatural evil agencies: early Christian view of, 50 ff.; present view of, 49 f.
Survey of the New Testament, 33 ff.
Synoptikos, meaning of, xvii

Textual criticism, 39 f.
Traditional religious ideas, 66

War, direct teaching concerning, 105; indirect teaching, 105 ff.
"What Would Jesus Do?" 67
Working principles, 184 ff.
World-civilization, view of a possible, 98 ff.
World-hope: catastrophic and evolutionary views of, 179; definition of, 178 f.
World of Jesus, the, 47 f.; God, supreme person in, 58; people a factor of, 56

Y.M.C.A., xviii, xx
Y.W.C.A., xviii, xx

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

THE CONSTRUCTIVE STUDIES

The Constructive Studies comprise volumes suitable for all grades, from kindergarten to adult years, in schools or churches. In the production of these studies the editors and authors have sought to embody not only their own ideals but the best product of the thought of all who are contributing to the theory and practice of modern religious education. They have had due regard for fundamental principles of pedagogical method, for the results of the best modern biblical scholarship, and for those contributions to religious education which may be made by the use of a religious interpretation of all life-processes, whether in the field of science, literature, or social phenomena.

Their task is not regarded as complete because of having produced one or more books suitable for each grade. There will be a constant process of renewal and change, and the possible setting aside of books which, because of changing conditions in the religious world or further advance in the science of religious education, no longer perform their function, and the continual enrichment of the series by new volumes so that it may always be adapted to those who are taking initial steps in modern religious education, as well as to those who have accepted and are ready to put into practice the most recent theories.

As teachers profoundly interested in the problems of religious education, the editors have invited to cooperate with them authors chosen from a wide territory and in several instances already well known through practical experiments in the field in which they are asked to write.

The editors are well aware that those who are most deeply interested in religious education hold that churches and schools should be accorded perfect independence in their choice of literature regardless of publishing-house interests and they heartily sympathize with this standard. They realize that many schools will select from the Constructive Studies such volumes as they prefer, but at the same time they hope that the Constructive Studies will be most widely serviceable as a series. The following analysis of the series will help the reader to get the point of view of the editors and authors.

KINDERGARTEN, 4-6 YEARS

The kindergarten child needs most of all to gain those simple ideals of life which will keep him in harmony with his surroundings in the home, at play, and in the out-of-doors. He is most susceptible to a religious interpretation of all these, which can best be fostered through a program of story, play, handwork, and other activities as outlined in

The Sunday Kindergarten (Ferris). A teachers' manual giving directions for the use of a one- or two-hour period with story, song, play, and handwork. Permanent and temporary material for the children's table work, and story leaflets to be taken home.

PRIMARY, 6-8 YEARS, GRADES I-III

At the age of six years when children enter upon a new era because of their recognition by the first grade in the public schools the opportunity for the cultivation of right social reactions is considerably increased. Their world still, however, comprises chiefly the home, the school, the playground, and the phenomena of

nature. A normal religion at this time is one which will enable the child to develop the best sort of life in all these relationships, which now present more complicated moral problems than in the earlier stage. Religious impressions may be made through interpretations of nature, stories of life, song, prayer, simple scripture texts, and handwork. All of these are embodied in

Child Religion in Song and Story (Chamberlin and Kern). Three interchangeable volumes, only one of which is used at one time in all three grades. Each lesson presents a complete service, song, prayers, responses, texts, story, and handwork. Constructive and beautiful handwork books are provided for the pupil.

JUNIOR, 9 YEARS, GRADE IV

When the children have reached the fourth grade they are able to read comfortably and have developed an interest in books, having a "reading book" in school and an accumulating group of story-books at home. One book in the household is as yet a mystery, the Bible, of which the parents speak reverently as God's Book. It contains many interesting stories and presents inspiring characters which are, however, buried in the midst of much that would not interest the children. To help them to find these stories and to show them the living men who are their heroes or who were the writers of the stories, the poems, or the letters, makes the Bible to them a living book which they will enjoy more and more as the years pass. This service is performed by

An Introduction to the Bible for Teachers of Children (Chamberlin). Story-reading from the Bible for the school and home, designed to utilize the growing interest in books and reading found in children of this age, in

cultivating an attitude of intelligent interest in the Bible and enjoyment of suitable portions of it. Full instructions with regard to picturesque, historical, and social introductions are given the teacher. A pupil's homework book, designed to help him to think of the story as a whole and to express his thinking, is provided for the pupil.

JUNIOR, 10-12 YEARS, GRADES V-VII

Children in the fifth, sixth, and seventh grades are hero-worshipers. In the preceding grade they have had a brief introduction to the life of Jesus through their childish explorations of the gospels. His character has impressed them already as heroic and they are eager to know more about him, therefore the year is spent in the study of

The Life of Jesus (Gates). The story of Jesus graphically presented from the standpoint of a hero. A teacher's manual contains full instructions for preparation of material and presentation to the class. A partially completed story of Jesus prepared for the introduction of illustrations, maps, and original work, together with all materials required, is provided for the pupil.

In the sixth grade a new point of approach to some of the heroes with whom the children are already slightly acquainted seems desirable. The Old Testament furnishes examples of men who were brave warriors, magnanimous citizens, loyal patriots, great statesmen, and champions of democratic justice. To make the discovery of these traits in ancient characters and to interpret them in the terms of modern boyhood and girlhood is the task of two volumes in the list. The choice between them will be made on the basis of preference for handwork or textbook work for the children.

Heroes of Israel (Soares). Stories selected from the Old Testament which are calculated to inspire the imagination of boys and girls of the early adolescent period. The most complete instructions for preparation and presentation of the lesson are given the teacher in his manual. The pupil's book provides the full text of each story and many questions which will lead to the consideration of problems arising in the life of boys and girls of this age.

Old Testament Stories (Corbett). Also a series of stories selected from the Old Testament. Complete instructions for vivid presentation are given the teacher in his manual. The pupil's material consists of a notebook containing a great variety of opportunities for constructive handwork.

Paul was a great hero. Most people know him only as a theologian. His life presents miracles of courage, struggle, loyalty, and self-abnegation. The next book in the series is intended to help the pupil to see such a man. The student is assisted by a wealth of local color.

Paul of Tarsus (Atkinson). The story of Paul which is partially presented to the pupil and partially the result of his own exploration in the Bible and in the library. Much attention is given to story of Paul's boyhood and his adventurous travels, inspiring courage and loyalty to a cause. The pupil's notebook is similar in form to the one used in the study of Gates's "Life of Jesus," but more advanced in thought.

HIGH SCHOOL, 13-17 YEARS

In the secular school the work of the eighth grade is tending toward elimination. It is, therefore, considered here as one of the high-school grades. In the high-school years new needs arise. There is necessary

a group of books which will dignify the study of the Bible and give it as history and literature a place in education, at least equivalent to that of other histories and literatures which have contributed to the progress of the world. This series is rich in biblical studies which will enable young people to gain a historical appreciation of the religion which they profess. Such books are

The Gospel According to Mark (Burton). A study of the life of Jesus from this gospel. The full text is printed in the book, which is provided with a good dictionary and many interesting notes and questions of very great value to both teacher and pupil.

The First Book of Samuel (Willett). Textbook for teacher and pupil in which the fascinating stories of Samuel, Saul, and David are graphically presented. The complete text of the first book of Samuel is given, many interesting explanatory notes, and questions which will stir the interest of the pupil, not only in the present volume but in the future study of the Old Testament.

The Life of Christ (Burgess). A careful historical study of the life of Christ from the four gospels. A manual for teacher and pupil presents a somewhat exhaustive treatment, but full instructions for the selection of material for classes in which but one recitation a week occurs are given the teacher in a separate outline.

The Hebrew Prophets (Chamberlin). An inspiring presentation of the lives of some of the greatest of the prophets from the point of view of their work as citizens and patriots. In the manual for teachers and pupils the biblical text in a good modern translation is included.

Christianity in the Apostolic Age (Gilbert). A story of early Christianity chronologically presented, full of interest in the hands of a teacher who enjoys the historical point of view.

In the high-school years also young people find it necessary to face the problem of living the Christian life in a modern world, both as a personal experience and as a basis on which to build an ideal society. To meet this need a number of books intended to inspire boys and girls to look forward to taking their places as home-builders and responsible citizens of a great Christian democracy and to intelligently choose their task in it are prepared or in preparation. The following are now ready:

Problems of Boyhood (Johnson). A series of chapters discussing matters of supreme interest to boys and girls, but presented from the point of view of the boy. A splendid preparation for efficiency in all life's relationships.

Lives Worth Living (Peabody). A series of studies of important women, biblical and modern, representing different phases of life and introducing the opportunity to discuss the possibilities of effective womanhood in the modern world.

The Third and Fourth Generation (Downing). A series of studies in heredity based upon studies of phenomena in the natural world and leading up to important historical facts and inferences in the human world.

ADULT GROUP

The Biblical studies assigned to the high-school period are in most cases adaptable to adult class work. There are other volumes, however, intended only for the adult group, which also includes the young people beyond the high-school age. They are as follows:

The Life of Christ (Burton and Mathews). A careful historical study of the life of Christ from the four gospels, with copious notes, reading references, maps, etc.

What Jesus Taught (Slaten). This book develops an unusual but stimulating method of teaching groups of students in colleges, Christian associations, and churches. After a swift survey of the material and spiritual environment of Jesus this book suggests outlines for *discussions* of his teaching on such topics as civilization, hate, war and non-resistance, democracy, religion, and similar topics. Can be effectively used by laymen as well as professional leaders.

Great Men of the Christian Church (Walker). A series of delightful biographies of men who have been influential in great crises in the history of the church.

Christian Faith for Men of Today (Cook). A re-interpretation of old doctrines in the light of modern attitudes.

Social Duties from the Christian Point of View (Henderson). Practical studies in the fundamental social relationships which make up life in the family, the city, and the state.

Religious Education in the Family (Cope). An illuminating study of the possibilities of a normal religious development in the family life. Invaluable to parents.

Christianity and Its Bible (Waring). A remarkably comprehensive sketch of the Old and the New Testament religion, the Christian church, and the present status of Christianity.

It is needless to say that the Constructive Studies present no sectarian dogmas and are used by churches and schools of all denominational affiliations. In the grammar- and high-school years more books are provided than there are years in which to study them, each book representing a school year's work. Local conditions, and the preference of the Director of Education or the teacher of the class will be the guide in choosing the courses desired, remembering that in the preceding list the approximate place given to the book is the one which the editors and authors consider most appropriate.

For prices consult the latest price list. Address

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO - - - - ILLINOIS

150 7/
CE /23

DUE DEC 10 1940